

The University of Chicago

A STUDY OF SUCCESS
AND FAILURE OF ONE THOUSAND
DELINQUENTS COMMITTED
TO A BOYS' REPUBLIC

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
1935

By
COURTLANDT CHURCHILL VAN VECHTEN, JR.

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1935

The University of Chicago

A STUDY OF SUCCESS
AND FAILURE OF ONE THOUSAND
DELINQUENTS COMMITTED
TO A BOYS' REPUBLIC

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

1935

By

COURTLANDT CHURCHILL VAN VECHTEN, JR.

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1935



PREFACE

This study began as an analysis of one hundred cases taken from the files of the Ford Republic while I was employed there in a teaching and research capacity. This preliminary report was submitted to Dr. A. E. Wood, of the Department of Sociology of the University of Michigan, for comment and criticism. This investigation indicated what materials were available for a more complete study, as well as showing some of the possibilities and limitations of the materials; it developed familiarity with the problems and suggested numerous hypotheses for further testing. It was then enlarged by an analysis of one thousand cases which are included in the present study. Pertinent to the solution of many of the problems involved in the Ford Republic study is the fact that I have been employed during the last two years in making parole predictions in current cases at the Illinois State Penitentiary at Pontiac. This experience has materially altered my conception of the possibilities, limitations, and uses of the prediction technique.

I am much indebted to my professors at the University of Michigan and at the University of Chicago for the training that made this work possible; to the officials of the Ford Republic at Farmington, Michigan, for their assistance in enabling me to gather the material herein contained. and to other workers in the field of prediction for their generous co-operation. In the first group the late Charles Horton Cooley and Dr. Arthur Evans Wood of the University of Michigan stand out, as do Dr. Ernest

W. Burgess and Dr. Edwin H. Sutherland of the University of Chicago. The Superintendent of the Ford Republic, Dr. C.P. Jones, is outstanding in the second group. In the last are numbered particularly Dr. Burgess, Mr. Clark Tibbitts, now of the FERA, and Mr. Ferris F. Laune.

For facilitating access to statistical machines I am indebted to Dean Donald Slesinger of the University of Chicago and to Dr. Paul Schroeder, Director of the Illinois Institute for Juvenile Research, and to his statistical assistant, Doctor Ackerson.

I wish especially to express my appreciation for the inspiration and guidance of Dr. Edwin H. Sutherland, teacher, co-worker, critic, and guide, during three years of graduate work and two of professional experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
PREFACE	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
II. THE FORD REPUBLIC	5
A. General Statement.	5
B. A Typical Introduction into Ford Republic Life	8
C. Functional Roles of the Persons at the Institution	11
D. The Employees' Group	13
E. Organization of Boy Life	15
III. PREVIOUS PREDICTION STUDIES	19
IV. METHOD AND TECHNIQUE.	25
A. Procedures	25
1. Selection of cases.	25
2. Handling of materials	26
3. Treatment of data	27
B. Definition of Success and Failure.	28
1. Success and failure	28
2. Success	32
3. Failure	32
4. Unknown and unclassified.	33
5. Follow-ups.	33
C. Criteria of Significance	34
D. Order of Presentation.	37
V. THE INDIVIDUAL FACTORS.	39
A. Introduction	39
B. Age.	39
C. Nationality.	40
D. Birthplaces.	42
E. Intelligence Quotient.	43
F. Psychiatric Classification	45
G. Defects Noted on Medical Examination	46
VI. FACTORS OF THE FAMILY BACKGROUND.	48
A. Introduction	48
B. Family Domestic Situation.	49
C. Comparative Ages of Parents.	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	D. Rank of Boy in Fraternity.	51
	E. Number of Children in Family	52
	F. Children other than Full Siblings in Family.	53
	G. Outsiders in the Home.	54
	H. Family Religion.	54
	I. Parents' Time in the United States, if not Natives	56
	J. Family Economic Status	57
	K. Sources of Family Income	58
	L. Physical Type of Home.	59
	M. Mode of Tenancy.	60
	N. Home Sanitation and Home Furnishings	62
	O. Home Rating.	63
	P. Records of Parents	64
	Q. Records of Siblings.	67
VII.	NEIGHBORHOOD AND SCHOOL FACTORS	70
	A. Introduction	70
	B. General Neighborhood Rating.	70
	C. Occupations Characteristic of the Neighborhood	71
	D. Boys from Same Neighborhood Concurrently	72
	E. Juvenile Delinquency in Neighborhood	72
	F. Gang Connections	73
	G. Type of School Last Attended	74
	H. School Grade Placement	75
VIII.	DELINQUENCY FACTORS PRIOR TO COMMITMENT	77
	A. Introduction	77
	B. Age First Delinquency.	77
	C. Frequency of Delinquency	78
	D. Number of Times in Detention Home.	79
	E. Probation Record	80
	F. Time on Probation.	81
	G. Previous Institutional Experience.	82
	H. Sources from which Received.	83
	I. Delinquency Charges and Records.	84
	J. Associates in Delinquency for which Committed.	86
IX.	THE INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS	90
	A. Introduction	90
	B. Ford Republic School Record.	91
	C. Ford Republic Work Record.	92
	D. Ford Republic Citizenship.	93
	E. Ford Republic Bank Account	94
	F. Ford Republic Library Use.	95
	G. Ford Republic Boy Court Record	97
	H. Ford Republic Sex Behavior	98

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. Number of Truancies from Ford Republic.	99
J. Length of Truancies.	100
K. Length of Stay in Institution.	102
L. Reasons for Long Stay.	103
M. Special Releases	104
X. THE POST-INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS.	106
A. Introduction	106
B. Agency to which Released	106
C. Delinquency Types after Release.	107
D. Reason for Maladjustment after Release.	108
E. Further Institutionalization	109
XI. IS THE GROUP OF KNOWN OUTCOMES REPRESENTATIVE?	111
XII. PREDICTION TABLES	116
XIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	130
A. The Ford Republic Material	130
B. The Missing Data	130
C. Problems of Method	131
1. Burgess vs. Glueck method	131
2. Methodological criticism.	131
D. General Observations	136
1. The value of the Ford Republic type of institution	136
2. The significance of the significance of factors	137
3. The concept of success.	139
4. Signposts for the future.	139
E. The Place of the Prediction Study.	140
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	144
APPENDIX A.	146
APPENDIX B.	168



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The rapidly growing literature of prediction studies and critiques upon them is indicative of the wide recognition which this attempt to apply scientific methods to penal problems has received in academic circles. That lay and legislative groups are conscious of the fact that the selection of individuals for parole is a serious problem is indicated by the action of the Illinois State Legislature in providing for parole prediction reports and research as an adjunct to the parole system of that state.

This study is an attempt to make a contribution to the literature of parole prediction by studying a group of a type which has not been dealt with in previous studies, by attacking certain methodological problems, and by testing certain hypotheses. In addition certain fundamental assumptions frequently made without recognition of their hypothetical nature are indicated and discussed. The point of view of this study is unique in that theoretical problems share attention with practical considerations based on the Illinois experiment in parole prediction.

The subject matter of this study is unique in the field in that it treats of boys all of whom were committed to an institution as a result of behavior difficulties. The majority of prediction studies have been of adults. Of the two exceptions, one deals in part with juvenile probationers and is complicated by the inclusion of females; the other deals with boys put through a psychiatric clinic upon request of a juvenile court but no uni-

form principle of treatment is involved.

The further distinction that the institution concerned is of the "junior republic" type, differing greatly in procedure and attitude from the typical official agency, is of very considerable importance, particularly in view of the claims by advocates of this type of institution that the treatment they recommend is much more effective upon delinquent boys than is more orthodox authoritarian penal practice. The fact that the institution is of this type has made possible the inclusion of an amount and variety of institutional records upon the individuals considered which far exceeds that of any other prediction study to date. The numerous important relationships disclosed between institution records and outcomes indicate that the activities resulting in these records have, if nothing else, greatly improved the basis for judgments of subsequent conduct.

A distinguishing methodological characteristic of this study is the treatment accorded the problem of missing data. Previous studies have followed one of two alternatives with regard to the problem. Either they have selected for consideration items upon which data were available in most cases and carried the remainder in residual "no record" categories which were treated just as the other categories for prediction purposes or they have simply assumed that those upon whom complete data were available formed an adequate prediction base for the whole group and ignored the remainder. This study considers all obtainable factors which seemed, at the time of its inception, likely to show a relation to eventual adjustment and specifically considers the problem of the significance of factors as affected by defective and missing data.

Parole prediction has already developed a critical liter-

ature. Some, but not all, of the criticism has been found within the major prediction studies. The problems of the reliability of the classifications made and those of the criteria of significance for outcome have received the most attention in the critical literature to date, but more recently the question of the intercorrelation of factors considered and the problem of the stability of the significance of factors from study to study have attracted attention. It is the contention of this study that it is necessary to establish the significance of the items considered but that no single criterion of significance is adequate, that classifications can be made more reliable in actual practice but that insistence on anything near absolute reliability means discarding most of the more significant data. It is further contended that the problem of intercorrelation is merely an aspect of the problem of weighting, and that while agreement or non-agreement with other studies may alter the a priori basis for the acceptance of an apparent relationship as a valid one it is not in itself a criterion of validity.

Many hypotheses regarding the relationship between various factors and subsequent behavior had been made at the Ford Republic and as the result of more general studies of parole prediction, of criminology, and of sociology. These hypotheses, in general, are implicit in the data and discussions presented below and their explicit statement is hardly essential.

The preparation of the material revealed some assumptions that were so basic and apparently self-evident that they had not been recognized. One of these was the assumption that those traits found in greater proportion in the penal institutional population than in the general population would similarly be found in a greater proportion of recidivists than non-recidivists.

This is revealed by the present and other studies as not true. Apparently there is no necessary or consistent relationship between the association of a factor with incarceration and its association with recidivism.

While the data presented here are based entirely upon Ford Republic material it is felt that it is both useful and justified to draw upon actual experience with the problems that arise in routine prediction work at points where that experience seems relevant.

It is important to note that statements made about the Ford Republic are as of the time this study was made; no efforts have been made to report administrative or other changes which may have taken place since June, 1930. While it is possible that changes might alter the violation rate and predictive significance of some items of data, it is not felt that such changes would affect the theoretical and methodological contributions which may be made here.

CHAPTER II

THE FORD REPUBLIC

A. General Statement

A description of the organization of the Ford Republic is needed in order that the behavior of the boys in the institution and after release from it may be appreciated.

The Ford Republic is a private institution, maintained by the "Boy's Home and D'Arcambal Association," which receives problem boys from ten to seventeen years of age. The plant consists of a 200 acre farm, two dormitories, school, gymnasium, and administration buildings. The institution is designed to accommodate 144 boys. Although it is located on the southern edge of Oakland County, Michigan, it considers that its main obligation is to the Detroit metropolitan area. Most of the boys are committed through the Wayne County Juvenile Court as delinquents. The County paid (at the time of this study) five dollars a week per inmate and the rest of the cost was borne by an endowment fund and the Detroit Community Chest.

The institution is run along the lines laid down in the George Junior Republic.¹ It speaks of itself to its inmates as a "self-governing institution" and a considerable effort is made to duplicate in so far as possible the conditions of a normal democratic social state on a miniature basis. The inmate citizens have voting power equal to that of officers in the enactment of legislation and the election of officers.

¹See William R. George and L. B. Stowe, Citizens Made

Each inmate goes to school and also works, and both school and other work are paid for on the basis of merit. Charges are made for board, clothes and other essentials; and the inmate citizens may purchase with their spare cash, if they have any, limited amounts of candy, athletic equipment, and other luxuries. Also, some misdemeanors may be paid for in cash if the defendant has the wherewithal. All accounts and transactions are in the form of a special "currency" good only in the institution.

This approximation of normal social existence dominates the institution routine and is, of course, dependent upon the recognition of private property and a high degree of individual freedom. It is the belief of the founders and administrators of this type of institution that living within a miniature social state in which the interdependence of the members and the necessity for law and order is apparent will develop an appreciation of the needs for and implications of citizenship in the larger society subsequent to release. In particular, the institution is designed to demonstrate that stealing is an offense against the whole group as well as against the particular victim.

In furtherance of this ideal even citizenship is voluntary to the extent that the institution is not fenced nor the buildings locked. Each boy has his own locker in which his private possessions are kept. The economic system of the institution permits of a considerable range of wealth and, as on the outside, the "rich" citizens are the objects of envy of some of the poorer ones. With boys of delinquent background it would be useless to hope for perfect honesty but thievery is kept down to remarkably low levels, probably as a result of the intimate social

and Remade (Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1912). The George Junior Republic, however, is unique in that it is co-educational.

situation. The principle of group responsibility for the behavior of its members is used to limit the number of truancies. In some cases of stealing or other special difficulty which cannot be traced to any particular individual, sanctions are used against the whole group unless the culprit is found and revealed. There is no doubt that these procedures do much to develop an esprit de corps within the group at the institution; how well the lessons of citizenship are carried over into lessons of citizenship in the larger free society remains an open question.

With the exception of the rare private cases demissions must be on order of the committing judge. The normal procedure is for the judge, upon recommendation of the superintendent of the institution, to sign an order transferring the individual from the institution to a parole in custody of one of the institution's parole agents. The rare occasions upon which releases are made in spite of the institution's objections are regarded by the inmates as evidence of "pull"; those in which a recommendation for release is rejected are resented by the whole inmate group. From the administration's point of view either action is highly destructive of institution morale. It is customary to release a boy to go with his parents when they leave the jurisdiction of the court. The average age at release was just under fifteen and in only eight cases was release necessary because the inmate had reached the age limit of the court's jurisdiction.

Truancies are not regarded with very great seriousness. They are punished if the individual is caught and at times certain sanctions are applied against the whole group if truancies occur. It is customary for officers to pursue truants and often inmates join in the chase. This is discouraged because occasionally pursuers fail to reappear and even those who do are likely to take

the occasion for a side trip to a source of cigarette "butts," an apple orchard, or melon patch; but in view of the collective responsibility imposed it can not be entirely prevented.

All statements as to policies and procedures of the institution are as of June, 1930; no attempt has been made to record changes which may have occurred since that date.

B. A Typical Introduction into Ford Republic Life

A sketch of the introduction of a typical member to the group may be helpful in showing how and with what preparation the ordinary Ford Republic boy comes into the stream of influence of the institutional group.

He is an American born boy of foreign parents living in a poor frame house in an immigrant district of Detroit. He can speak his parent's tongue only imperfectly and can read it almost not at all. He has picked up most of his attitudes from the gang on the street with which he plays and has very little respect for his parent's notions on conduct and ethics. He is certain in his religion but really knows very little about it and goes to church only when compelled to. He is one of a family of four or five; he has a step-parent. His street lore has told him that this is a source of freedom, for step-parents are notoriously unreasonable so that you don't have to mind them at all. If they hit you, you can tell your own parent or the dead parent's relatives, or even the neighbors or police; they will sympathize with you and blame the step-parent for being too harsh.

At about the age of nine, while in the second grade, our young delinquent begins to play truant. "Skipping school" is ordinarily the first act toward proving that one has nerve and belongs in the gang. This continues and becomes progressively more

pronounced. The school authorities "let it slide" for a while, accepting faked excuses; but finally the truant officer comes around to the mother, who has suddenly and inexplicably forgotten all her English and can hardly be made to understand at all. However, she promises that Stanley will be at school regularly. Stanley comes home from his daytime hangout to find an irate parent who trounces him soundly and makes him promise to go to school every day. She does not want him to be taken by the law that has already taken her nephew Walter and so many other boys in the neighborhood, but she knows that she will not always be so successful in protecting him as she was today. Stanley is impressed, for he is fond of his mother, and goes very regularly to school for a time; but the unanimous opinion of his playmates that she is just full of old-fashioned ideas which a real "he-boy" should scorn finally has its way and the truancies recommence. The older members of the gang are now beginning to enjoy the spoils of their depredations in the neighborhood. The more successful and daring they are, the more they are admired and envied by the younger boys. Stanley is almost twelve now and has occasionally "snitched" fruit from the peddlers' wagons and stands; so when fourteen-year old Tony offers to take him and his particular pal, Joe, "robbing" in the five-and-ten, he is honored by the condescension of this admired person and suppresses as cowardice all scruples he may have. The first raid having been a success, although the older boy appropriated a large share of the spoils, the raids are continued. As he gets more experienced, he takes more chances and before long is caught and taken to the detention home. As he has never been there before he is usually released on unofficial probation the next day and a police officer is sent to investigate the family and the boy's past. Now that he has been arrested,

the boy's position in the gang is more secure; but he must demonstrate his nerve and skill in further stealing. By this time his school truancy has again become serious and his mother is much disturbed by his failure to return home for meals and by his occasional all-night absences; also she suspects him of "knocking down" on her when he is sent to the store for groceries.

The next time he is arrested he is held for a week or two, and then has a formal hearing at which he is warned and put on official probation. In the meantime, in the detention home and from the older boys in the community, he has learned, as he thinks, all about the various institutions to which he may be sent: "Ford Republic isn't so bad; they don't keep you locked up, so it's easy to run away if you want to. Your folks can visit you every week. Lansing¹ is harder, but they teach you a trade and you can get out quicker. (This last is not true although the boys seem quite convinced that it is.) They keep you locked up and they have a discipline cottage where they put you if you try to run away or anything very bad. At Ford Republic they give you 'cracks'² or make you walk the 'merry-go-round.'³ If you run away from there and get caught you get a 'line-up'⁴ or maybe they send you to Lansing."

Stimulated in an attitude of bravado by the boys who have recently returned from these institutions, he convinces himself that he is not afraid of either. Besides, he wouldn't get sent up, he is just a little too smart. Half a dozen scrapes which he

¹Boys' Vocational School; the State Reform School for Boys.

²Blows with a leather strap ordered by the boy judge and inflicted by the boy sheriff. They were abolished early in 1930.

³A circular path in the front yard. The boys are required to walk around for stated periods of time as a punishment.

⁴The most severe punishment used; it consists of one spank

gets out of with nothing more serious than a short period of detention and official probation have convinced him that there is nothing much to fear if he does get caught.

Finally he is caught in the more dangerous and more lucrative art of breaking into stores. He is taken to the detention home and held until the others of the gang can be apprehended, the witnesses subpoenaed, and the case called, perhaps a matter of months. By this time he is thoroughly disturbed and anxious to be allowed to return home. He really believes that he will make good if given "one more chance," but his probation officer points out that he has said that before and that now it is too late. He is given an examination by the Wayne County Clinic for Child Study which finds him suspicious but willing to please. The Clinic reports that he has an I. Q. of 80, which is somewhat lowered by language handicap, and rather poor social judgment; and it finds that he is quite egocentric and somewhat unstable emotionally.

C. Functional Roles of the Persons at the Institution

The personnel of the institution is made up of two main groups, inmates and officials, or as they are commonly known, citizens and employees. The boys are divided into two groups, each having its own building. Each building has a capacity of 72 boys. The buildings are: Ford, for the more mature boys thought to be capable of self-determination; and Baldwin, for the younger and more immature boys in need of parental care. Nominally both groups have the same form of self-government but the control by the employees is quite direct and open in the case of the younger group, and on occasion democratic forms in the younger group have been

from each of the other boys in the same building.

removed altogether. Segregation on the basis of ability to cooperate in self-government is not complete as it has occasionally been found necessary to remove large but mentally defective boys from the younger children's group to prevent them from bullying the younger boys and taking advantage of them in other ways. In general, the two groups are separated in school because of their different achievement levels.

A not altogether successful effort is made to keep the groups separate in all their play activities. The proximity of the two buildings and the limited extent of the play area, all on one side of the boys' buildings, prevents the effort at segregation from being entirely successful. The boy groups eat separately but are often together in their incidental duties around the grounds. It seems to be the general opinion of the employees that troubles increase proportionately as the two groups are allowed to mix.

The administrative workers, known to themselves and to the boys as employees, consist of the superintendent and his office secretary; the principal of the school and the teachers (ordinarily, six women teachers and two men for gymnasium and shop work); and the buildings and grounds superintendent, who is in charge of the firemen; a farmer and his helper; and a general handy-man. The Baldwin night watchman and the two dormitory matrons, the cook, kitchen superintendent, nurse, and relief employees are under the supervision of the principal. Periodical duties such as the laundry, supervision of visiting, cutting ice, running the Sunday evening motion picture, and so forth are apportioned among the employees as equitably as possible. Two employees live away from the institution. They are the counselors who often prepare the way for the return of the boy to his home

upon release, and who have the duty of following up the boys in the capacity of parole officer and family counselor after release. Certain of the women teachers also make periodical visits to the boys' homes and endeavor to establish a favorable rapport between the parents and the institution, and to eliminate conflicts between the children and the home if such exist, as is often the case. While quantitative data are lacking, it is the universal belief of the employees that the attitudes of the parents toward the institution and toward the boy while he is in it have a very great deal to do with his success in the institution and his conduct subsequent to release.

D. The Employees' Group

Being a Ford Republic employee implies being at the institution practically all of the time. Employees have two week-ends off a month; at other times they live on the place, eat in one of the employees' dining rooms, have their washing done in the institution laundry, and their housework done by house boys. While most of the employees have cars, a mile of road that is not always passable separates the school from the car line and it is an eighteen-mile ride into downtown Detroit. Employees without a circle of friends within reach have very few opportunities to make new acquaintances. They are, of course, free to leave the place at times when they have no duties; but, since evening duties several times a week are the rule, work often interferes with plans for recreation in the evening.

The conduct of the employees is closely circumscribed by various social factors.

In considering the social factors governing individual employees various points must be taken into account. In general,

it may be assumed that they were brought up in normal American environments and have acquired the attitudes and mores characteristically resulting from such experience. However, the very fact of the constant association in many fields of activity - for instance, eating - with the co-workers introduces a degree of social control that is not found in normal communities. The life has very many "goldfish" characteristics in that everyone knows all about the comings and goings of everyone else and is in constant contact with the other members of the employee group. Conduct is further circumscribed by the constant presence of the boys who can be relied upon to tell all that they hear, together with much that they imagine, all in a highly distorted form, if given any opportunity to do so.

In spite of their constant association, or perhaps because of it, the employees do almost nothing as a group. Attempts by the administration to foster employee meetings on a social and recreational basis were met with such apathy as to be practical failures. Most of the employees are married and with one exception during the time spent there on this study, the wives also held positions. The women teachers are the only group of young unmarried persons and, with exceptions, they seem to get along very well together in the cottage in which they all have rooms. The married couples have their emotional ties outside of the institutional routine and with the exception of the couples related by blood or marriage there is almost no social life, as the term is ordinarily understood, on the place. In fact, personal distastes are not rare and there was one case in which two parents took their respective daughters to the Detroit School in Redford, a distance of five miles, at exactly the same time each morning and brought them back at exactly the same time

each evening and continued to do this for a period of years. This situation was the result of a mutual belief, that each had been doing more than his share of the driving. This had precipitated an estrangement that continued because neither would unbend sufficiently to make any overtures although both realized the absurdity of the situation. The persons concerned made an effort not to speak or meet except on business and not to face each other in the dining room, although they ate in the same room, lived in the same house, had their cars in the same garage, and worked and lived in the same restricted environment.

While the institution is not under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Education, the practice has been to accept as teachers only persons licensed to teach in the public schools and most teachers have had considerable experience in teaching before coming to the institution. The other employees are expected to have no special qualifications other than experience with the material they are to handle and ability to get along with the administration and the inmates. The last qualification is necessary to preserve the morale of the institution, as the employee who has constant disciplinary problems is a distinct detriment to the functioning of the institution. The two field parole agents have had previous experience at this type of work.

Salaries are adequate but not princely, particularly in view of the demands of the work. There is very little labor turnover; a circumstance which is at least in part due to the fact that the institution has had one superintendent throughout its existence.

E. Organization of Boy Life

Some conception of life as it is lived at the Ford

Republic seems essential to an adequate understanding of the forces of social control. The economic basis of the institution from the viewpoint of the employee and the outside community has been described. From the point of view of the boy it is quite a different matter. The State of Ford has its own currency. Boys are paid for all their work in terms of this currency and they are charged for what they get. The rate of pay on jobs varies from fifteen to twenty-four cents an hour depending on the ability, initiative, honesty, and reliability of the boy concerned. School is also paid for, the poorest rate being fifteen cents per hour, the best being twenty-four. A boy's rate of school pay is determined by averaging his grades for each week. Fixed percentages are required for each rate of pay; thus, the difference between 89 and 91 in average means a difference of a dollar in school pay. Office holders are paid for their services.

The boy spends the money thus earned for board, room, and clothing. If he has money remaining after these charges are met, he may use it to purchase certain privileges and luxuries. These are: candy, to a maximum of three half-pounds a week; going to the show; paying court fines instead of taking other forms of punishment; buying extras in the dining room; special clothes; athletic equipment; and, on occasion, trips off the place. Finally, the condition of a boy's bank account is a large factor when a recommendation for his release is under consideration.

Life in the boy groups at the Ford Republic differs from the previous experiences of the boys in numerous important respects. Foremost is, of course, the fact of institutional instead of family life. Of hardly less significance to some boys is the fact that it is American in language and attitudes in spite of the great heterogeneity of the racial origins of the boys. That

it is composed exclusively of delinquents is no novelty to many of them, but the decidedly limited geographic area in which life is carried on and the twenty-four hour a day association with other boys is. To the ordinary boy the routine of work, school, play, eating, and sleeping is a tremendous break with his past, as is the constant association with adults who supervise most of his conduct.

Practically all of the boys have been held in the detention home and not a few of them in the parental home. Although the Ford Republic is not their first institutional experience, it is essentially different from the lock-and-key regime of the detention home, as is evident in the different attitudes of the boys toward it. Whatever their conduct in the Republic they feel that they ought to make good and to co-operate with the authorities.¹ The attempts at escape from the detention home are marked with a violent hostility toward the authorities that is missing in the actions of Ford Republic truants.

The problem of leadership within inmate groups is an interesting one. Fouille² seems correct in that in any given situation the individual who can express in words, concrete ideas, the impulses and desires already existing in the group, assumes leadership. It is further true that an idea changes when it is stated in words, so that in a very real sense the leader, who owes his position to the fact that he has been able to put into concrete form the more or less inarticulate impulses of the group, finds himself remolding those impulses in many details until the

¹There are exceptions, of course, but the norms of the boy group demand resistance to the police and the detention home authorities but require "making good" in Ford Republic.

²Education from a National Standpoint, translation (New York: D. Appleton Co., 1897).

final result is a very appreciable element of direction that is peculiarly that of the leader.

Dr. C. P. Jones, superintendent of the institution, has said that:

A boy that is large and strong and a leader at athletics can almost always have office if he wants it. Sometimes office is forced upon a boy; one of our best presidents was forced into the job rather against his will.

Aside from this he has stated that he has never been able to find any common denominator of leadership. It is true that he has never made a statistical effort to enumerate the characteristics of leaders as compared with other boys, but this does not invalidate the very significant observation that there is no obvious or tangible criterion of leadership in the institution other than the fact of a following.

Miniature social movements within the institution are frequent and due to the generally unstable nature of the inmates, tend to be violent. It is not unusual to find one boy leader and his following striving to make an Utopia of the place while at the same time another leader will be trying to organize resistance to the administration. In such a situation the personal prestige of the individual leaders is very important in determining which shall be followed. Occasionally a boy of the type which may be called "natural leaders" arrives and dominates the boy group. When such a natural leader and the official leader, the boy president, are combined in one person his attitudes and wishes dominate the institution to a very considerable extent.

CHAPTER III

PREVIOUS PREDICTION STUDIES

There is nothing new about the idea of evaluating the probability of a future happening on the basis of past experience. Insurance, which depends upon actuarial ratings worked out with more or less precision, dates back at least to Roman times; Quetelet and other early statisticians were impressed by the fact that they could predict from past experience the total number of such infrequent occurrences as suicides which would happen in a given year.

The attempt to use actuarial procedure for the evaluation of social risks by welfare agencies is distinctly new, however, and has been largely confined to the study of paroles. For many years various institutions had reported the percent of "success" among the individuals they released and this rate had tended to be rather close to 75%.¹ There is reason to believe that the definitions of success used and the accuracy of the follow-up were more important in accounting for the variations reported than the conduct of the individuals released.

S. B. Warner,² in 1923, attempted to find the bases upon which paroles were granted or refused at the Massachusetts Reformatory and to relate these to eventual outcomes. He found that only "Offense," "Recidivism," and "Alienist's report" were signi-

W. W. Clark, "Success Records of Prisoners and Delinquents," Journal of Delinquency, July, 1921, pp. 443-52.

"Factors Determining Parole from the Massachusetts Reformatory," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, August, 1923, pp. 172-207.

fificantly related to outcomes and concluded that the institution records did not provide an adequate basis for determining who would and who would not succeed on parole.

Hornell Hart,¹ writing later the same year, took Warner's data and showed that many of the differences Warner had considered insignificant were in fact statistically important and suggested the possibility of combining the data so that the effects of the small but significant differences would be summated.

E. W. Burgess,² as one of a committee appointed to study parole and the indeterminate sentence in Illinois, made the first attempt to put into practice the suggestions of Hart. Burgess's methodology is still the fundamental one in the field; it is also the basis for the work of the Illinois sociologist-actuaries, the only official workers in the field to date.

Burgess studied a thousand men at each of the three Illinois institutions with regard to a number of characteristics. He states: "Twenty-one factors were selected by which each man was graded, in comparison with the average of the 1000 cases, upon the probabilities of making good or of failing on parole."³ He considered any factor which showed a violation rate less than the average as a favorable point, any one over the average as unfavorable, and based his predictions on the number of favorable points.

Burgess apparently took what data he could get from the institutional records and includes such items as "Charge," "State-

¹"Predicting Parole Success," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, November, 1923, pp. 405-14.

²A. A. Bruce, E. W. Burgess, A. J. Harno, and J. Landesco, Parole and the Indeterminate Sentence (Springfield: State of Illinois, 1928).

³Ibid., p. 247.

ment of prosecutor and judge," "Working when arrested," "Time served," "Psychiatric classification," and "Social type." He nowhere states what basis was used in the selection of the factors for inclusion in the prediction tables. He does state that "no attempt was made to correlate religion with parole violation"¹ and justifies this on the grounds that church preferences of prisoners do not greatly vary from those of the general population and that inmates did not go to church voluntarily in any case.

At the time this study was projected, Burgess's work was the most recent one in the field. Since then there has appeared a number of further studies contributing to this field. One of the most important was that of the Gluecks,² which appeared in 1930. This study featured a thorough and costly follow-up of the lives of the parolees studied and did not rely on official or social agency records for its data. For prediction purposes contingency coefficients were calculated to determine the relation between the factors studied and eventual outcome, and a small number of factors with the highest contingency coefficients was used, with the factors weighted by the specific violation rates of the sub-categories.

In 1931 Clark Tibbitts,³ who had done much of the field work in Burgess's study, published a report of a prediction study based on 3000 parolees from the Illinois State Reformatory at Pontiac. This study, in addition to having a base that was more adequate numerically than that of previous studies, introduced new criteria of significance; for, instead of accepting any devi-

¹Ibid., p. 233.

²Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, 500 Criminal Careers (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930).

³"Success or Failure on Parole Can Be Predicted," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, May, 1931, pp. 11-50.

ation from the average as significant, Tibbitts, while using the same factors, considered as significantly favorable only those sub-categories showing a violation rate of under 20% and as significantly unfavorable only those showing a violation rate of 30% or over (the average violation rate was found to be 24.7%). While this represented an improvement over Burgess's method of taking any deviation from the average rate as significant it was recognized that it was arbitrary in that a 3% deviation in a factor having a large number of cases might be more important than a 6% deviation in a factor involving few cases. It also introduced the problem of a variable number of significant factors as some individuals fell into statistically significant sub-categories on almost every factor and some on almost none, a problem that Tibbitts does not seem to have fully appreciated at the time the study was presented.¹

G. B. Vold,² in the same year, contributed a study of 1192 men from the Minnesota Penitentiary and the Minnesota Reformatory and an excellent comparison of the Burgess and Glueck methods which makes it possible to omit much detail here. The main problem of the Burgess "unweighted, many factors" method versus the Glueck "weighted, few factors" method resolved into one of theory and of ease of calculation rather than one of reliability in face of the .922 correlation Vold found on applying the two methods to the same data. Vold also raises the question of the reliability of classifications, particularly such subjective ones as "Social

¹The Tibbitts study is the basis for the parole prediction work at which the author is now engaged at the Pontiac Branch of the Illinois State Penitentiary. Two years of presenting prediction reports to the Parole Board have resulted in some minor modifications in technique.

²Prediction Methods and Parole (Hanover: Sociological Press, 1931).

type"; to this may be added the problem of the reliability of the basic data.

Tibbitts,¹ writing in 1932, attempted to answer the question of the reliability of the classifications by presenting comparisons of two sets of ratings made by him at different times from the same data. This study showed, as had been expected, a decidedly high degree of deviation in the more subjective categories and an appreciable deviation in the supposedly objective ones. The deviations, however, were not usually such as to materially change the significance of the factors concerned and the ultimate prediction scores, where altered at all, were usually not more than one scale position apart.

Elio D. Monachesi has presented a prediction study which is not concerned with parole.² His study was made under the tutelage of Vold at Minnesota and follows Vold's work very closely as to form and method. This study covers 896 juvenile probations, of which 179 were of girls; and 619 adult probations, of which 51 were of women. The study presents a discussion of the significance of differences as determined by statistical tests³ and presents the results of checking a sample of the cases for reliability in what were assumed to be the more subjective categories. These showed that where the various classifications, for instance, that of "Occupation," were assigned scale positions the deviations seldom exceeded two steps and the contingency coefficients ran from a low of .742 to a high of .943 with perfect agreement usual

¹"Reliability of Factors Used in Predicting Success or Failure on Parole," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, March, 1932, pp. 844-53.

²Prediction Factors in Probation (Hanover: Sociological Press, 1932).

³Ibid., chap. v.

in about 85% of cases.¹

The last two of the Gluecks' works² consider prediction methods but seem at least equally interested in other aspects of the careers of the individuals they study. These studies maintain the previous high standards of investigation of the persons studied by do not contribute much new material in the way of parole techniques; although they attempt in the Juvenile study to answer the problem of weighting thus:³

Since the method previously used by us, by reason of its employment of only those few factors in the careers of offenders demonstrated to bear the highest predictive value, simplifies and therefore makes more practicable the actual use of forecasting devices by judges, parole boards, and others, we have retained it in the present work.

It is doubtful whether it is simpler to add a set of decimals or to count the number of favorable factors in a case and still more doubtful that judges or parole boards will be content with a prediction based on half a dozen factors, such as "Discipline by father," "Discipline by mother," and "School retardation."⁴

¹Op. cit., chap. vi.

²One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934), and 500 Delinquent Women (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1934). The one thousand juvenile delinquents are boys referred to the Judge Baker Foundation by the Juvenile Court of Boston, Massachusetts. The work of this institution is illustrated by the Judge Baker Foundation Cases (Boston: Judge Baker Foundation, 1922 et seq.). Its head is William Healy, whose Individual Delinquent (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1915) is an accepted classic in the literature of juvenile delinquency.

³One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 186.

⁴This problem was discussed at some length by the author in a paper on "Problems of Reliability," presented in the section on Parole Prediction of the 1934 convention of the American Sociological Society and published in abstract in the Abstracts of that meeting.

CHAPTER IV

METHOD AND TECHNIQUE

A. Procedures

1. Selection of cases.- It was determined in advance to take one thousand consecutive admissions to the Ford Republic for purposes of statistical study which, it was hoped, would reveal relationships between eventual adjustment and other determinable factors in the lives of the inmates of the institution. These thousand cases included all admissions over a period of more than seven years ending in the fall of 1929.¹ As the study was begun early in 1930 this meant that the earliest cases had been out seven years and that some of the more recent ones were still in the institution. Cases once recorded were revised upon the receipt of new data during the progress of the study so that the reported outcomes are as of June 4, 1930. There are included in the one thousand cases thirty-eight that were still in the institution on that date.

The records of several years were included, obviously, in order to secure a sample which would be statistically significant. Current cases were included in order that the investigator might be able to compare records of boys who were personally well known to him with those of boys who were not and thus interpret more satisfactorily the records of earlier years; also, the administration of the institution was interested in a study which would be of current significance. Some cases which are included were

¹Ford Republic Cases #601, received April 20, 1922, to #1600, received September 5, 1929.

still in the institution at the time of the study, others had been out a very short time. It was recognized that these cases could not legitimately be classified as to outcomes. This necessitated the adoption of a measure of success and failure which is somewhat different from the definitions used in other studies.¹ Fears that the large range in the period since release would distort the success ratio do not seem valid in view of the fact that there is no significant trend in the proportion of the cases successful during the period covered by this study² and also in view of the finding of a success ratio which was almost identical with that found by another investigator³ for boys leaving the institution between 1912 and 1924.

2. Handling of materials.— Most of the material used was found in the folders and on the cards of the boys in the office files. This was supplemented, particularly in cases where essential data were missing, by Wayne County Detention Home records, by the memory of various employees, and, in the cases of about one hundred and fifty of the boys herein considered, by direct contacts with the boys.

The data from all sources were transferred to individual record sheets.⁴ After consideration of this material a series of

¹ See below, pp. 32 f.

² The sheets on which the favorable and unfavorable points were indicated and added had 80 cases each, except the last two, which had 88 and 34. The ratio of successes and failures shows no trend when recorded by sheets:—

Successes	23	26	22	23	22	32	24	30	34	29	12	11	..
Failures	29	30	23	13	23	28	35	29	26	32	17	14	7

³ Mr. Roy Olson, special investigator for the institution, in a report dated December 11, 1929, stated that of the 865 boys who left the Ford Republic between January 1, 1912 and November 24, 1924 he was able to locate 670, of whom 333 had apparently clear records. This represents a better percent of checkups than the present study but almost an identical success ratio. The overlap of the two studies is about 128 cases.

⁴ Incidentally, it may be appropriate to remark that these

codes was constructed and the data recorded, in code form, on a number of large ruled sheets. From these code sheets cards for the mechanical sorting and tabulating were punched.

Once the significance, if any, of the various items of data was determined, it was necessary to record the outcome and number of favorable and unfavorable factors for each case. It was found that this was much more simply done by counting directly from the coded sheets than from the punched cards. For ease in checking, the lines of coded figures were first marked with characteristic colors - green to indicate "success," violet to indicate "failure." Then each column was marked with pencil to indicate unfavorable items, green ink circles indicating favorable items. Next the number of favorable and unfavorable items for each of the successes and each of the failures was counted. The distribution of scores of each group is given in conjunction with the discussion of the prediction tables.

3. Treatment of data.- One fact that is most conspicuous is the lack of completeness of the records. There is hardly an item which is not missing in one or more cases and some are missing in the majority of cases. In particular the police reports vary extremely in completeness and accuracy. Psychiatric reports were relatively rare before January 1, 1929, but were included in most of the court's cases after that date. There was a period in 1922 when most of the records contained intelligence test reports, but these became infrequent in later years. Similar variations in the adequacy of reports on some of the other items were found. Some of the omissions are apparently due to clerical errors and

face sheets, containing practically all the essential data available on the boy, have proved very useful in cases in which the Court or Psychiatric Clinic has requested information.

to carelessness.

In working with the material a practice was gradually evolved of taking the various records available in a routine order and expecting to get certain information from each record. In the not infrequent cases in which a record contradicted one which had previously been consulted, the point in question was held in abeyance until the whole record had been consulted and the item entered in the form which seemed most likely to be correct.

Where classifications involving an evaluative aspect have been made, an effort is made to introduce as little interpretation as possible into the final data; and great hesitancy was the rule with regard to filling in missing items of data by inference from statements or records which were not definitely to the point.

An attempt was made to determine the presence or absence of selective factors in the data. The question of selection as to outcome is discussed at some length in Chapter XI. In the body of the material as related to outcomes certain selective tendencies in the presence of data are noted and discussed. They are taken into consideration in the determination of the predictive significance of factors.

B. Definition of Success and Failure

1. Success and failure.— Much has been written on the subject of correctional institutions, most of it to praise or condemn particular institutions or types of institutions in terms of alleged success or failure in solving the communities' crime and delinquency problems.

However, it soon becomes perfectly obvious to anyone having any considerable contact with American penal institutions (and

with these are included juvenile courts and juvenile institutions, in spite of their paternal and equity aspects) that there is no principle back of the treatment accorded offenders. Or perhaps it were more accurate to say that there is a multitude of principles, often unrecognized, frequently disguised, and many times in conflict, so that the treatment accorded a particular offender represents some sort of compromise between the various lines of treatment which would logically follow from the espousal of reformation, punishment, deterrence, or some other principle. Nor is there any particular situation which determines which factors shall rule in a given case.

Nevertheless, the newspaper which pleads for long and harsh prison sentences and continuously plays up the revenge motive for punishment (cloaked with respectability under the term "debt to society") expects the institution for delinquents to produce citizens who will be non-delinquent in the future, and the public at large does likewise. It follows that for all the multiplicity of considerations dictating treatment of offenders there is only one for evaluating the results of that treatment - the "success" or "failure" of the individual after the treatment is over.

It is believed that this factor is sufficiently important to become the central point of this study. It is also believed that the definitions of "success" and "failure" as hereinafter used correspond well with the popular conception of those terms. It is necessary to point out two reasons, however, why the institution studied after the manner of this paper should not be judged by its rate of success or failure as defined by the eventual adjustment of its inmates. The first has already been indicated; it lies in the fact that even in the most enlightened of

juvenile jurisdictions the principle of treatment, of reformation, is forced to compromise time and again with that of punishment, of deterrence, of others; and with the inadequacy of facilities for more suitable treatment. The second lies in the fact that the institution has a relatively short time in which to reshape completely a personality developed by years of contrary associations, and many times a personality which is sufficiently plastic to be quickly made over for good remains so plastic that evil influences on the outside soon reshape it again for the worse.¹ The storm of protest that arose over a recent work² is a good example of how the public reacts in judging an institution by the subsequent acts of its inmates.

It has been observed that the rate of failures from any penal institution is very largely a function of the definition of failure used.

Official agencies usually give either the rate of convictions for new crimes, which will often bring the rate down to 5% or lower; or new convictions plus those returned for violation, which usually gives a rate of about 25%.³

¹As Sutherland puts it: "The offender who remains reformed must be superior to the society in which he lives." Principles of Criminology (Chicago: Lippincott, 1934), p. 549.

²A careful reading of Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, 500 Criminal Careers, will show that the authors had no idea of holding Concord Reformatory responsible for the high rate of subsequent crime of its parolees, but that was the conclusion jumped at by many lay readers and accepted by many institution and parole people who claimed either that their own systems were better than that of Massachusetts or that the Gluecks were misrepresenting the facts as to subsequent crimes of parolees. It should be noted that the extremely high violation rate found by the Gluecks was at least in part due to the distinctly rigid definition of subsequent criminality adopted by them.

³The length of time of supervision is important as longer supervisory periods naturally result in a greater percent of ultimate violations. It is a paradox that while closer supervision undoubtedly results in fewer new crimes it results in an increase in the violation rate due to the greater number of minor or tech-

The Illinois¹ and Minnesota² studies are based on official records of violation.³ The recorded rate of failure in the first study was 22.1% at Pontiac Reformatory, 26.5% at the Menard Penitentiary, and 28.4% for the penitentiary at Joliet. Vold found that the average rate of failure for the State Reformatory and the State Penitentiary of Minnesota considered together was 21.8%.⁴ The Gluecks used very rigid definitions of recidivism⁵ and also carried their cases through individual investigation for a considerable period of time and found correspondingly high violation rates, with 78.9% of the adults and 82.2% of the juveniles classified as failures.

The inadequacy of judging success or failure on the basis of the official records of a brief period of parole is recognized; nevertheless, realization is held of the futility of classifying as "failures" of treatment those who have joined their non-convicted brothers in violation of minor city ordinances or been detected by observers in the well-nigh universal practice of committing crimes for which they are not arrested.

nical violations that are discovered and reported.

¹Burgess, op. cit., and Tibbitts, "Success or Failure on Parole Can Be Predicted."

²Vold, op. cit.

³Official records of violations do not include even all the violations of parole agreement known to the parole authorities as it is customary to use warnings or even brief periods of detention in jails in cases of purely technical violations such as getting married without permission or being out after 9 P. M., where criminal intent is clearly non-existent. These are violations, of course, but are never reported as such.

⁴Op. cit., p. 32.

⁵Cf. Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, 500 Criminal Careers, p. 188: "Success: No police, court, or prison record, except for occasional technical automobile violations; no dishonorable discharge from the Army or Navy; no commission of individual criminal acts, even though no arrest or prosecution followed.....21.1%

Institutional experience is well calculated to make the observer see the problem from the point of view of the public - in terms of actual eventual adjustment, for it is what the public sees and hears of adjustment and delinquency that determines its support of or hostility toward institutional practices, particularly parole.

For this reason specific and positive definitions were adopted for success and failure, leaving the doubtful middle ground as "unknown" or undetermined.

2. Success.- A boy is classified as a success if he had given definite indication that he was making and, in the opinion of the parole agent, would continue to make an acceptable social adjustment. Specifically this meant that he must be either going to school, working at a legitimate occupation, or seeking work at one. If at home he must be "getting along" with his parents; and if married, living with his wife. No boy who was wanted by the police or who was in the hands of any state or private institution for neglected, dependent, or delinquent persons is classed as a success. In all cases, however, the classification is made on the basis of the most recent information available and an individual who filled the requirements given above is not considered as other than a success because delinquent behavior had intervened in the period between release from the institution and the making of an eventual adjustment.

3. Failure.- Any individual in any institution for neglected, dependent, or delinquent individuals is classified as a failure as are fugitives from justice and those engaged in reg-

were in the success category." Cf. also Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, pp. 151 f., in which case 11.8% were "non-delinquent during the five-year post-treatment period."

ular criminal activities. Familial, marital, or economic maladjustment stopping short of delinquency and dependency are not considered as adequate to justify a classification as failure.

4. Unknown and unclassified.- This group includes: first, all those on whom no data were available after they had been released on parole from the institution; second, those who had not been out of the institution long enough to establish any definite records; third, those upon whom the data were too scanty to justify an evaluation; and fourth, those upon whom there were adequate data, but who failed to fulfil the definite requirements set out for success or failure.

5. Follow-ups.- Where there were records upon a boy subsequent to his release they were in most cases from sources of high reliability. The basic records, available in the majority of cases were those of the parole agents (styled "family counselors"). In addition to this newspaper clippings were kept which were useful as a record of subsequent commitments. A large amount of information was gathered by the institution visiting teachers in their visits to the homes of active cases as these homes were often in the neighborhood of those of families with whom the teacher was previously acquainted. Where such previous contacts could assist they were used, thus continuing the contact of the institution and the former boy. Some information was gathered from old boys who returned and some from inmates.

According to the classification of outcomes used in this study 288 boys were classed as successes, 306 as failures, and the remaining 406 were unclassified. The first two groups are spoken of as those of "known" outcomes. Of these 48.5% are successes and 51.5% are failures. These percentages are used as the basis of comparison in efforts to determine the association of

other factors with outcomes.

C. Criteria of Significance

A consideration of the various criteria of determining the fact of a relationship between two variables will indicate that no one of them is free from objections if used to determine the fact of a relationship between outcomes and each of the other variables considered. Burgess used any factor at all deviant from the mean obviously admitting factors in which the deviation may be due only to chance error. Tibbitts used five percent deviation from the average as his criterion. This does not represent an adequate correction of the deficiency of the Burgess criterion because it ignores the vitally important consideration of the variable number of cases in the different categories. A difference of less than five percent may be significant if based on enough cases; one of considerably more than that may be due to chance if based on only a few; and, in fact, the judgment of significance is reversed in no less than 38 of Tibbitts' 167 items if the standard deviation of a difference formula is substituted for his arbitrary five percent criterion.

The standard deviation of a difference formula provides a test which will exclude items not statistically significant.¹ But since this method is applicable only to single pairs of items it is inadequate as a test of the significance of a table showing a progression. The Gluecks used the contingency coefficient as a measure of the probability that the observed distribution is due to chance; this method, likewise, is inadequate for the determination of the significance of a continuum, since it gives the same results regardless of the order in which the items within

¹For a discussion of the mathematics and illustration of the use of this test, see Monachesi, op. cit., chap. v.

the categories are placed. The Pearsonian coefficient, on the other hand, is designed to show such continuities, but cannot be used in prediction studies because of the nature of the basic success-failure criterion. The use of the Westergaard expectancy method was considered but it was found that the number of cases was too small for its application and it was not clear that revelation of the differences between observed and expected rates would give any answer to the question of the possibility of the deviation's being due to chance.

Consequently it is hard to find single tests which include all factors which are significant and exclude all those which are not. It is necessary to proceed in terms of W. F. Ogburn's oft repeated emphasis on the importance of acquaintance with the data. The a priori reasons for accepting or rejecting the apparent implications of the available data must be given weight. These may be based on the general body of criminological literature, other comparable studies, and also upon the more individual experiences. The importance of definite continua, either quantitative or qualitative, where they exist, must be given serious attention even in the absence of statistical tests capable of demonstrating their significance.

Unfortunately, the only prediction study dealing with juveniles published prior to the determination of the significance of the factors and the construction of the prediction tables for this study was that of Monachesi, which appeared in 1932 and which had attributes which admitted of the assumption that the same characteristic might be significantly favorable in his study and unfavorable in this one or vice versa. Those attributes were: primarily, the fact that he was studying probation, which is quite different than parole in its implications for personality; and,

that he included 179 girls in his group of 896 juveniles,¹ an inclusion which seems to cast a very serious doubt on the significance of his factors as applied to individuals of one sex or the other.

The Gluecks's One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents appeared after the calculation of the prediction tables for this study, but for purposes of comparison footnotes are attached indicating their results in the categories covering the same phases of the boys' life. It is recognized that the Gluecks's study is likewise not one of paroles, although some paroled cases are included. Its basis of selected problem cases from a juvenile court with a jurisdiction almost entirely confined to what are commonly called "delinquency areas" has been ably brought out in reviews of the work. Likewise, the extremely rigid definition of success may well have resulted in changing the classification of some of the factors. It is further regretted that the work does not give the success rates associated with all the sub-categories studied instead of simply giving the "most favorable" categories. In spite of these and other criticisms the study does present a careful piece of work with an adequate number of cases and a number of categories comparable to those used here, and the indication of similarities and differences in results will aid in the interpretation of both pieces of work.

The .92 correlation found by Vold² between the Glueck and Burgess methods of compiling prediction tables left a free selection of method. Analysis of the two indicated that the Glueck method was capable of improvement only if factors of higher contingency coefficients could be found; and no assurance was felt

¹Op. cit., p. 29.

²Op. cit., chap. vi.

that such factors could be found. On the other hand, it was believed that a refinement of the Burgess method which would substitute adequate criteria of significance for the factors used would permit of considerable improvement of that method without sacrifice of the new material which might be developed. The problem of intercorrelation is an aspect of the problem of weighting; for it is recognized that the counting of factors is not the absence of weighting but the giving of unit weight and use of perfectly intercorrelated factors is simply assigning double weight. In using a method of unit weighting then, the problem of intercorrelation must be considered. But it is important to note that there is no a priori reason to believe that the weighting of the more highly associated factors would injure the prediction tables. In actual practice an attempt was made to note where intercorrelation existed and to consider the extent of the intercorrelation; where it was demonstrable that neither of the indices was wholly included within the other, both were used.

D. Order of Presentation

Since, in view of the importance of the observed continua and the a priori convictions, it was decided that no single criterion of the significance of particular items could be employed, the policy of judging each item studied on the basis of its particular characteristics is followed. For this reason the items considered will be presented individually and the basis of the determination of the significance or non-significance of each item will be indicated.

In many cases it is felt that the actual number of successes and failures is much more important than the percentages. For this reason percentages are presented only where they are an aid to easy but accurate understanding of the implications of the

table.

In order to simplify the presentation the factors were divided into the following groups: The Individual Factors, Factors of the Family Background, Neighborhood and School Factors, Delinquency Factors Prior to Commitment, Institutional Factors, and Post-Institutional Factors, each of which forms a chapter in this study. Appendix A has been added to give the complete basic data on each category considered.

CHAPTER V

THE INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

A. Introduction

Under this head are considered those factors which concern the inmate as an individual. Age and birthplace were available for almost all of the boys but it is apparent that a selective factor was operative in the cases of those that had been put through the child study clinic, as any report from this source tended to be unfavorable. The alternative possibilities are that the psychiatric examination had a harmful effect or that the particularly difficult cases were the ones that were referred to the clinic. The first alternative seems hardly tenable but the second gives support to the reviewers of the Gluecks's One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, who have claimed that the high violation rate recorded there is, at least in part, a function of the selection by the court of particular problem cases for reference to the Judge Baker Foundation. Apparently judges of both courts recognize as special problems and refer to clinics a selected group of the most difficult cases.

B. Age

Age as used in this analysis is the age, to the nearest year, at the time of arrival in the institution. As shown in Table I, there is a very significant difference between the number of successes among boys 9-12 years of age and the number of successes among boys 15-17 years of age. The standard deviation test shows a variation of almost four sigma between these two groups.

The intervening group, aged 13-14, approximates the average success ratio and is therefore not considered to be prognostically significant. The Gluecks's oldest age group ("13 or over") was the most favorable category under the head of "Age of offender at J. B. F. examination".¹

An individual in the age group 9-12 receives an unfavorable point in computing scores for the prediction table; one in the group of 15-17 receives a favorable point; membership in the intervening group has no effect on the prediction score.

TABLE I*

AGE

Age	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
9, 10, 11, 12.....	50	36.2	88	63.8
13, 14.....	115	47.9	125	52.1
15, 16, 17.....	123	57.2	92	42.8
Totals.....	288	48.5	305	51.5

*Tables giving the detailed data for the "Unknown" group as well as for the "Known" group and including in each case the figures on the number of individuals upon whom data were not available will be found in Appendix A.

C. Nationality

A boy's nationality is determined by the birthplace of his parents with the exceptions that Jewish, Negro, and Indian are also presented in the same table. Hyphenated nationalities were used to indicate divergent race. In the case of Jewish the original data was recorded in terms of both the nation of birth and

¹One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 180.

the Jewish group. Nationality is not found to be a significant factor in the eventual adjustment of these boys, as is evident in Table II. In no case is it possible to establish any significant deviation from the average success rate for any national group; accordingly the factor does not enter into the prediction tables. A tentative hypothesis that eventual adjustment was more probable in the case of first generation immigrants' children is not borne out, as those of foreign parentage have a success rate of 47.7%, which is slightly below the average and below the 54% success rate of those of native parentage. The impression still persists, however, that among those from exceptionally good homes - as judged by ordinary domestic standards - the boys in the black sheep category did not do well.

TABLE II
NATIONALITY

Nationality	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Polish.....	106	110
American White....	52	45
Italian.....	23	24
German.....	13	15
Irish.....	4	8
Hungarian.....	3	7
Canadian.....	4	6
Syrian.....	4	4
Lithuanian.....	6	2
English.....	2	3
Austrian.....	2	4
French.....	2	4
Roumanian.....	4	1
Greek.....	4	1
Serbian.....	2	4
Russian.....	3	3
Ukrainian.....	1	1

¹Sutherland, in Principles of Criminology, pp. 114-18, discusses the "excessive criminality of the second generation" and gives references to some of the best of the extensive literature on the subject.

TABLE II--CONTINUED

Nationality	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Slavic.....	2	2
Scotch.....	1	3
Armenian.....	1	3
Other Foreign....	7	6
Jewish.....	10	10
Negro and Indian..	12	13
Mixed American and Foreign...	9	14
Mixed Foreign.....	11	11
Totals.....	288	304

D. Birthplaces

Nothing of significance for outcomes is noted from the table of birthplaces. Though in some cases the more general terms, as "Michigan," include cases which should rightfully be classified under the more circumscribed heads, as "Detroit," the deficiencies are not significant. It would have been desirable to have had the length of residence in the locality from which committed; although it is believed that this also would have failed to show a significant relationship.

TABLE III
BIRTHPLACES

Birthplace	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Detroit.....	125	144
Michigan.....	26	25
United States....	30	30
Pennsylvania.....	31	17
New York.....	10	7
New Jersey.....	1	1
Massachusetts.....	1	1

TABLE III--CONTINUED

Birthplace	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
District of Columbia.....	...	1
New Hampshire.....	...	1
Connecticut.....	1	1
Rhode Island.....	...	1
Ohio.....	6	6
Illinois.....	6	11
Indiana.....	1	2
Wisconsin.....	6	2
Missouri.....	1	3
Iowa.....	1	...
Nebraska.....	...	1
Kentucky.....	2	2
West Virginia.....	1	3
Tennessee.....	3	1
Georgia.....	...	2
South Carolina...	...	1
Alabama.....	1	...
Texas.....	2	...
North Carolina...	1	1
Delaware.....	...	1
Arkansas.....	...	1
Oklahoma.....	...	1
Oregon.....	...	1
California.....	...	1
Wyoming.....	1	...
Canada.....	8	10
Poland.....	12	8
Italy.....	8	4
England.....	2	2
Germany.....	2	1
Russia.....	2	1
Austria.....	1	1
Jugoslavia.....	1	1
Hungary.....	2	...
Malta.....	...	1
Armenia.....	...	1
Scotland.....	...	2
Syria.....	1	...
Totals.....	287	301

E. Intelligence Quotient

The relation of intelligence to success during and subsequent to parole has aroused considerable interest, as has the whole field of criminal intelligence. A good many studies have

found intelligence relevant, but unfortunately they have not agreed on just what the relationship is.¹ The chronological age of offenders seems very important in this connection as different results are obtained from the study of different institutions even when made by the same individual.² Intelligence quotients - practically all of them from the Wayne County Clinic for Child Study - were available in 355 cases with an average I. Q. of 80.6. These were grouped in class intervals of 10, the success rates for successive groups of known outcomes, beginning with the interval 51-60, being 23, 24, 28, 41, 54, 43, and 25 percent.

TABLE IV
INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT

Intelligence Quotient	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Up to 80.....	29	26.6	80	73.4
81 to 100.....	34	45.9	40	54.1
101 and over.....	7	38.9	11	61.1
Totals.....	70	34.8	131	65.2

This definite curvilinear relationship is based on a sufficient number of cases so that the 41% and 54% success categories, corresponding to I. Q.'s from 81 to 100 are classed as neutral for prediction purposes and those above and below that as unfavorable. That the very fact of any I. Q. appearing in the record is unfav-

¹The fact that it is still impossible to evaluate the influence of environmental factors in the results of intelligence tests should not be overlooked.

²Cf. Pontiac and Joliet figures in A. A. Bruce et al., Parole and the Indeterminate Sentence.

orable is presumably due to the selective influence which caused judges to make a point of referring boys who seemed "queer" to the mental clinic.

F. Psychiatric Classification

The terminology in the psychiatric reports varies widely,¹ due to the long period of time covered and the large number of psychiatrists who made the reports.

TABLE V
PSYCHIATRIC CLASSIFICATION

Psychiatric Classification	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Defective psychopath..	1	20.0	4	80.0
Unstable; Impulsive;				
Emotional; Temper.	4	33.3	8	66.7
Constitutional psycho-				
pathic personality	..		4	100.0
Constitutional				
inferiority.....	3	30.0	7	70.0
Simple hebephrenia....	2	22.2	7	77.8
Egocentric.....	2	40.0	3	60.0
Marked introversion...	1	25.0	3	75.0
Marked extroversion...	2	50.0	2	50.0
Infantile; Neurotic;				
Sensitive.....	9	52.9	8	47.1
Conflicts.....	1	50.0	1	50.0
Traumatopsychosis.....	1	100.0	..	
Totals.....	26	35.6	47	64.4

The lack of uniformity in psychiatric classifications together with the frequent assumption of psychopathy merely from the fact of the crime is often a serious limitation to the useful-

¹The variety was so great that it was only with difficulty and, possibly, some violence, compressed into the 12-place capacity of the punch cards.

ness of psychiatric reports for statistical work, however useful they may be for the study of individual cases.

As in the case of "Intelligence quotient" the whole group having psychiatric reports in their records have a below average success rate. It would possibly have been better to have accepted this in making the prediction table; instead the various categories are divided into two groups on the basis of results. The first seven classifications in the accompanying table are grouped and considered as unfavorable, while the last four are treated as without significance for the prediction table. Once the grouping had been made there is a significant difference between the unfavorable group and the average for the whole group. The favorable group, however, does not show a significant deviation from the average.

G. Defects Noted on Medical Examination

The data classified under the head of "Defects" are highly inadequate as only 76 of the cases of known outcome have recorded defects whereas the actual number of such defects is well known to be much higher. It is significant that the group with recorded defects, taken as a whole, shows a failure rate of only 2.5% above average. Those defects which may be classed as physical are associated with a success rate slightly higher than expected;¹ those classed as inferiority habits (enuresis and nail biting)

¹The Gluecks, in One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, page 180, found "Poor" as the most favorable category under the heading of "Health of offender at J. B. F. examination." On the other hand, there are numerous authenticated cases in which physical handicaps have acted to produce economic and psychological situations which have led to criminality. There is no doubt that there is a greater proportion of physical defects among delinquents than among the general population, particularly those resulting from neglect and malnutrition; but their significance for continuation in crime is not definitely settled. See also Sutherland, op. cit., pp. 84 ff.

show only 18% as successes which, even with a small sample, gives a deviation of 2.8 sigma according to the deviation of differences formula. While 3 sigma is considered necessary to preclude the possibility of the observed difference being due to chance, the difference in this case is so well reinforced by a priori assumptions that the category of "Inferiority habits" is included as an unfavorable factor in the prediction table.

TABLE VI
DEFECTS NOTED ON MEDICAL
EXAMINATION

Defects	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sensory organs.....	4	57.2	3	42.8
Neural structure.....	6	66.7	3	33.3
Minor physiological...	10	52.1	9	47.9
Major physiological...	4	40.0	6	60.0
Diseases.....	7	58.3	5	41.7
Stigmata.....	1	50.0	1	50.0
Glandular deficiency..	1	16.7	5	83.3
Inferiority habits....	2	18.2	9	81.8
Totals.....	35	46.0	41	54.0

CHAPTER VI

FACTORS OF THE FAMILY BACKGROUND

A. Introduction

In all, nineteen items of data were gathered which came under the head of "Factors of the Family Background." These factors show a range from almost complete recording to very scanty data and from high relationships to outcome to, apparently, none at all. The data in this section were obtained in part from police statements and routine and official questionnaires and in part from home investigations by probation officers and the institution's visiting teachers. In marked contrast to the cases which have had the more intensive psychiatric investigation, the cases which have been subject to intensive and competent social investigation, with consequently more complete data, show a general tendency to a higher than average success rate. In view of the selection of problem cases for psychiatric examination no comparison of the efficacy of psychiatric and social investigations is implied; but since no principle of selection of cases for social investigation could be discerned, the evidence would seem to indicate that such investigation does in fact assist in the planning of an effective course of treatment for the individual concerned.

Conspicuous also in this group of data is the predictive superiority of the admittedly subjective category of "Home rating" over such relatively objective categories as "Economic status," "Sources of income," "Physical type of home," "Home sanitation," "Home furnishings," and even the criminality of parents and sib-

lings.

B. Family Domestic Situation

Under the head of "Family domestic situation" some dozen categories of death, divorce, and desertion are considered in addition to the so-called normal home. The category of "Father dead" gives 26 successes and 17 failures for a success percentage of 60.5. "Mother dead" gives 23 and 16 for a percentage of 59. These two combined are 2.5 standard deviation from the average of the group, indicating that the probability of such a deviation happening by chance is rather remote (.57%); on the other hand, it is hard to find a priori grounds for assuming that the loss of one parent is a favorable factor. The group of 312 outcomes from other than "normal" homes has a success rate almost identical for that of the whole group - 48.1%. The "normal" category similarly gives a success rate almost exactly average. The "one parent dead" categories are the only ones used in construction of the prediction tables.

It has been almost universally assumed that broken homes were responsible for a great part of juvenile delinquency. This as a particularist explanation seems to have been largely broken down when that nemesis of particularisms, the control group, was considered. Shaw and McKay¹ introduced the control group in the study of delinquents' families and found that the disproportion of delinquents from broken homes was much less than had been assumed. While the Gluecks² found chances of success greatest if the parents were married and living together, the low contingency

¹"Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency," in National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on the Causes of Crime, II, Washington: 1932.

²One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 179.

found (.059) would not seem to justify the conclusion that their data indicated that the fact of a broken home had very great predictive significance for their juvenile delinquents.

TABLE VII
DOMESTIC SITUATION

Domestic Situation	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Father dead.....	26	60.5	17	39.5
Mother dead.....	23	59.0	16	41.0
Divorced - custody to father.....	5	33.3	10	66.7
Divorced - custody to mother.....	17	47.2	19	52.8
Living with relatives.	11	37.9	18	62.1
Separated - custody to father.....	3	42.9	4	57.1
Separated - custody to mother.....	6	50.0	6	50.0
Father deserted.....	9	56.2	7	43.8
Mother deserted.....	..		4	100.0
Maintained by charities.....	3	60.0	2	40.0
Stepfather.....	24	41.4	34	58.6
Stepmother.....	23	47.9	25	52.1
Totals.....	150	48.1	162	51.9

C. Comparative Ages of Parents

The table on the relative ages of parents proves rather interesting in itself but shows no significant relationship to success or failure¹ and so is not used in the prediction table.

¹The Gluecks, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 67, find differences in age of parents to be "of some significance" and (pp. 179 ff.) find that the factor has "more than a slight association with post-treatment conduct" with a difference in age of 6-10 years as "most favorable." The Gluecks's categories are not the same as those used here but the data are apparently at variance, with neither study giving a conclusive answer.

TABLE VIII
COMPARATIVE AGES OF PARENTS

Comparative Ages	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Mother older than father.....	17	16
Parents same age..	19	10
Father 1-10 years older.....	100	106
Father over 10 years older...	16	20
Totals.....	152	152

D. Rank of Boy in Fraternity

Rank of the boy in the group of siblings of which he was a member was included in the material to be studied because of some suggestive results that had been produced along this line by other studies, and because of the results found in the preliminary study. The group of first children, which category, of course, included all the only-children, had a success rate of 44.6% based on 184 known outcomes. The rate of success rose steadily from second through sixth place, the percentages being 48, 49, 54, 58, and 60. Above sixth place there were only 10 known outcomes, too few for the rate to mean much. Although the deviations from the average were not very great the orderly progression seemed conclusive of the validity of the differences and so "First" was considered unfavorable; "Fourth," "Fifth," and "Sixth" favorable for the prediction table.¹

¹The Gluecks, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 180, found "Third in rank" as the most favorable category under the head of "Rank of offender among siblings" and also found (p. 77) that in general their cases came from families above the average in size. See also Sutherland, op. cit., pp. 150 ff., on "Order of birth in relation to crime."

At the present stage of criminological knowledge the explanation for the progressively better success of the younger members of families is best left to conjecture; or, possibly, to the psychoanalysts. That the relationship is striking, particularly by contrast with the apparent absolute insignificance of the number of children in the family (except only-child families), can not be denied. Particular cases can be cited in which older brothers, even though themselves delinquent, have led or forced their younger brothers "out of the racket" but it is mere hypothesis unverifiable on the basis of this study, to suggest that this phenomenon accounts for the general trend noted.

TABLE IX
RANK OF BOY IN FRATERNITY

Rank of Boy	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
First.....	82	44.6	102	55.4
Second.....	77	47.8	84	52.2
Third.....	50	49.0	52	51.0
Fourth.....	32	54.2	27	45.8
Fifth.....	19	57.6	14	42.4
Sixth.....	9	60.0	6	40.0
Seventh.....	2	28.6	5	71.4
Eighth.....	1	100.0	...	...
Ninth.....	1	50.0	1	50.0
Totals.....	273	48.4	291	51.6

E. Number of Children in Family

Number of children in the family is also considered and, with the exception of the category of "Only child," in which the success rate of 31% is based on a sufficient number to be statistically significant, is conspicuous for the absolute lack of in-

fluence of number of children on success rates. Indeed, upon the assumption that there is no relation between number of children (except only-children) and outcomes, it is seldom that deviations greater than those noted would not appear through mere chance in a sample of this size.

Because scoring an only-child as unfavorable would overlap the unfavorable score given "First" in the table "Rank of boy in fraternity," it is not added as an additional factor in the prediction table.¹

TABLE X
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY

Number of Children	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Only child.....	19	42
Two.....	44	45
Three.....	49	47
Four.....	50	53
Five.....	37	35
Six.....	29	24
Seven.....	13	14
Eight.....	10	12
Nine and over.....	9	8
Totals.....	260	280

F. Children other than Full
Siblings in Family

Only 63 homes were recorded in which the children are not of one fraternity. This probably under-represents such homes but their correct number is not known. In view of the small number of cases it is obvious that the slight difference found could not

¹The preceding footnote will also relate to this category. It is striking that the Gluecks found but 38 only-children in their one thousand (One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 86).

be considered as significant, nor is the below average success rate of the group as a whole significant according to the standard deviation of a difference test.

TABLE XI
CHILDREN OTHER THAN FULL
SIBLINGS IN FAMILY

Relationships	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Half-brother or -sister.....	19	19
Step-brother or -sister.....	4	6
Foster-brother or -sister.....	1	3
Half- and step- brother or sister.....	4	6
Step- and foster- brother or sister.....	..	1
Totals.....	28	35

G. Outsiders in the Home

The presence in the home of roomers and other adults who are not members of the "normal" family has even less significance than the presence of children, who have just been considered. Consequently these factors are not used for prediction purposes.

H. Family Religion

That more than half of the boys are Roman Catholics is attributable to the fact that more than half the inhabitants of the areas from which they were committed are Catholics. There is no apparent relationship between religious faith and success after release from the institution. This is one of the few items

upon which all the prediction studies seem agreed.¹

TABLE XII
OUTSIDERS IN THE HOME

Outsiders	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Roomers.....	29	33
Resident relatives	20	19
Servants and roomers.....	1	2
Roomer and relative.....	3	3
Co-operative families.....	1	1
Outsiders.....	..	1
Totals.....	54	59

TABLE XIII
FAMILY RELIGION

Religion	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Roman Catholic....	154	170
Protestant.....	72	78
Orthodox.....	11	8
Jewish.....	9	9
Christian Science.	1	1
Totals.....	247	266

¹Hebrew or Jewish is favorable, according to the Gluecks (One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 179), and according to Clark Tibbitts, "Success or Failure on Parole Can Be Predicted," JOLO, March, 1932, p. 24. But Tibbitts considers "Jewish" under the heading of "Nationality" and it may be argued that the group has what unity it possesses more on a cultural than on a religious basis.

I. Parents' Time in the United
States, if not Natives

The fact of foreign birth in itself has no apparent significance. For those whose parents were foreign-born there is a definite curvilinear relationship, with success highest for the groups whose parents have been in this country 10 to 20 years. This is rationalized on the assumption of cultural conflicts in the children of the recent arrivals and inadequacy of control on the part of the aged parents. All items in this table are included in the prediction table, all except "10, under 20 years" being unfavorable.

TABLE XIV
PARENTS' TIME IN THE UNITED STATES

Time in U. S.	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 5 years.....	3	30.0	7	70.0
5, under 10 years.....	7	38.9	11	61.1
10, under 20 years.....	122	53.5	106	46.5
20, under 30 years.....	37	43.5	48	56.5
Over 30 years.....	17	42.5	23	57.5
Totals.....	186	48.8	195	51.2

The Gluecks¹ found that "a fifth of the fathers of the boys were born in the United States," but arrived at the somewhat questionable conclusion that "nine-tenths of the parents had lived in the country long enough to adapt themselves reasonably to American standards."² One familiar with areas of concentrated

¹One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 65.

²Ibid., p. 67.

foreign settlement may question if the 10 years the Gluecks allow do result in such adaptation. But the Gluecks find a "more than slight association" with outcome for the category with "Under 10 years" as the most favorable. Assuming that adaptation to American standards by the parents should help the children adjust, the results of this study do more to bolster the Gluecks's conclusion than do their own.

J. Family Economic Status

Although the category "Family economic status" is based on data definitely more objective than the social worker's estimate of the home, it shows no demonstrable relationship with outcomes.¹ The category "Good" seems most favorable, followed by "Very poor," "Fair," "Poor," and "Very good,"² in that order. No item in this category is used in the prediction table.

This does not mean, of course, that poverty is not a cause of crime. There is no assurance either in logic or in fact that an attribute more frequently possessed by criminals than non-criminals will also be disproportionately represented in that part of the same criminals who get into further trouble. Thus, both Tibbitts, "Success or Failure on Parole Can Be Predicted," p. 24, and the Gluecks, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 65 and p. 179, find higher percentages of children of the foreign-born parents in their delinquent groups than in the general population but find that these individuals contribute a smaller proportion of the recidivists than they do of the delinquent groups. Monachesi, op. cit., p. 30, also found that "...children of foreign-born parents are much better probation risks than those of native-born parents," although 53.3% of his cases had one or both parents foreign-born, a rate that is certainly higher than for the whole population of which they were a part. On the other hand, the Negroes, who contribute a disproportionate part of the criminal group, have been found by almost all observers to contribute an even greater part of the recidivists.

"Very poor" indicates dependent; "Poor" indicates a standard of living inadequate to sustain health and morals; "Fair," adequate subsistence but no reserve; "Good," a margin of comfort and reserve; "Very good" indicates relative affluence. This scale was arrived at by studying the cases in which both specific statements and evaluations were made; the author made evaluations from specific statements in some cases.

TABLE XV
FAMILY ECONOMIC STATUS

Family Economic Status	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very poor.....	18	46.2	27	53.8
Poor.....	40	43.5	52	56.5
Fair.....	33	44.6	41	55.4
Good.....	68	54.8	56	45.2
Very good.....	9	42.9	12	57.1
Totals.....	168	48.0	182	52.0

K. Sources of Family Income

If the amount of family income failed to comply with a priori expectations, the source of it does no better. Here the primary classification is between father and mother as source of income, and this shows an appreciable but not conclusively significant tendency to make success higher when the mother is a breadwinner. Most writers have assumed that a situation in which the mother was a breadwinner was associated with a rate of delinquency which was higher than the rate when the father supported the family. The Ford Company workers were tabulated separately in an effort to ascertain whether the Ford Company's Social Service plan could be shown to be significant. A secondary classification is in terms of how and how much is made; this shows no conclusive relation to outcomes.

TABLE XVI
SOURCES OF FAMILY INCOME

Sources	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Father at Ford plant.....	51	47
Father at other auto plants..	22	22
Father laborer; under \$25....	33	31
Father at shops; \$25-\$42.....	37	54
Father independ- ent; over \$42	51	48
Father Public Welfare Dept.	3	2
Mother at Ford plant.....	1	2
Mother at other auto plants..	3	2
Mother laborer; under \$25....	21	25
Mother at shops; \$25-\$42.....	11	6
Mother independ- ent; over \$42	28	23
Mother Public Welfare Dept.	22	16
Totals.....	283	278

L. Physical Type of Home

An inspection of Table XVII, which presents a classifica-
tion of physical types of homes indicates no significant relation-
ship between the type of home and the eventual outcome. Conse-
quently none of these items is used.

TABLE XVII
PHYSICAL TYPE OF HOME

Type	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Frame.....	161	164
Multiple family frame.....	53	49
Flats, or with stores.....	22	15
Apartments.....	12	13
Brick houses.....	9	12
Miscellaneous....	1	...
Totals.....	258	253

M. Mode of Tenancy

With 541 cases of known outcome on record the category "Mode of tenancy" is one of the most complete in the study. This is of especial interest because in 295 of these cases the parents of the boys are at least nominal owners of their homes. This is a condition which probably would be found in no other city of a million people in the world - the result of the erection on the sand plains around Detroit of innumerable poorly-built one- and two-family frame houses sold to immigrants "on contract" - terms which satisfied their desire to own land and created obligations to pay almost indefinitely. While there is only about 10% difference in success rate between home owners' sons and all other types of tenancy the number of cases is so great that the difference is statistically significant, so that ownership appears as a favorable item in the prediction table and all other items as unfavorable.

Participation in a previous study had led to the belief that home ownership was not as important for delinquency as cus-

tomarily assumed.¹ In that study delinquency rates, population increase, percent foreign-born and Negro, and percent of home ownership in Chicago areas as revealed by the 1930 census were subjected to multiple and partial correlation. While the zero order correlation between delinquency and percent home ownership was $-.40$ the correlation fell to $-.12$ when population change and percent foreign-born and Negro were held constant. On the other hand, the correlation between delinquency and percent foreign-born and Negro fell only from $.69$ to $.52$ when the influence of population change and home ownership were held constant. Apparently the high social ratings of areas of high tenant ownership are largely a function of related variables.

TABLE XVIII
MODE OF TENANCY

Mode of Tenancy	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Own home.....	155	52.5	140	47.5
Rent home.....	97	43.5	126	56.5
Rent furnished rooms...	7	53.8	6	46.2
Room and board.....	...		2	100.0
Quarters for service...	3	37.5	5	62.5
Totals.....	262	48.4	279	51.6

In general, home ownership indicates more stable personalities in the parents, better family integration, and less mobility. In times of economic crisis, however, in specific cases

¹S. Ranson, C. C. VanVechten, Jr., and R. Lang, Analysis of Juvenile Delinquency Correlations (unpublished manuscript submitted to Dr. Samuel Stouffer, University of Chicago, 1931).

of buying on contract even food and clothing are sacrificed in order to keep up the payments, which must be made regularly so as to retain the investment that has already been made in the home. In these cases the reduced standard of living may provoke hunger and dissatisfaction that lead to stealing.

N. Home Sanitation and Home Furnishings

In addition to income, "Home sanitation" and "Home furnishings" are the other supposedly more objective indices of the home.¹ Like income also, they fail to coincide with a priori expectations. On the face of returns success is most highly associated with very poor sanitation and furnishings. This is possibly because inmates from these homes do not return to their families upon release but are placed at work. Rank order correlations show a $-.1$ correlation between sanitation and success and plus $.2$ between furnishings and success. It did not seem justifiable to include either of these categories in the prediction table.

TABLE XIX
HOME SANITATION

Home Sanitation	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very poor.....	24	57.1	18	42.9
Poor.....	35	48.0	38	52.0
Fair.....	65	43.6	84	56.4
Good.....	119	52.0	110	48.0
Very good.....	20	54.1	17	45.9
Totals.....	263	49.6	267	50.4

¹The author did not do the home visiting; he accepted the

TABLE XX
HOME FURNISHINGS

Home Furnishings	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very poor.....	10	71.4	4	28.6
Poor.....	42	46.7	48	53.3
Fair.....	41	54.0	35	46.0
Good.....	77	55.8	61	44.2
Very good.....	12	60.0	8	40.0
Totals.....	182	53.8	156	46.2

O. Home Rating

"Home rating" consisted of a simple subjective rating in a five-place scale from "Very good" to "Very poor." This rating was made by an officer of the juvenile court or by a visiting teacher of the institution. It will be seen that a definite progression is established, based on data on 470 known outcomes. Apparently these subjective estimates do mean something.¹ It is noted that these ratings are much more definitely related to outcomes than the more objective factors such as "Economic status," "Sources of income," "Home Sanitation and Furnishings."

For prediction purposes the lowest category is considered

statements of the investigators of the juvenile court and the institution. These statements usually consisted of definite statements as well as the evaluation; the following is typical: "The home consists of two dark poorly furnished rooms overlooking a foul alley, but the mother manages to keep it fairly clean and tidy."

¹Various attempts have been made to develop objective standards of home rating. J. H. Williams, "The Whittier Scale for Grading Home Conditions," Journal of Delinquency, November, 1916, pp. 273-86, is one of the better known ones. M. R. Fernald, M. H. S. Hayes, and A. Dawlet, A Study of Women Delinquents in New York State (New York: Century Co., 1920), p. 216, uses the five-point scale used here but bases the rating on a combination of

as unfavorable; the upper three as favorable. In this category the mere presence of a record shows a slight favorable tendency, indicating, possibly, that the cases in which social investigations have been most thoroughly done are the ones most likely to succeed. In this study no attempt has been made to rate separately moral standards and supervision of the homes.

TABLE XXI
HOME RATING

Home Rating	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very poor.....	39	45.9	46	54.1
Poor.....	58	47.5	64	52.5
Fair.....	66	52.4	60	47.6
Good.....	58	54.2	49	45.8
Very good.....	17	56.7	13	43.3
Totals.....	238	50.6	232	49.4

P. Records of Parents

The records of parents and siblings were examined for evidences of defectiveness and delinquency. In the absence of a control group of non-delinquents with similar backgrounds this study can offer little criticism of the hypothesis that criminality and defectiveness in the parents is productive of criminality in the offspring. It is noted that the complete data concerning parents includes 212 records indicating social inadequacy in one parent and 58 cases in which such records are noted for

similar ratings of economic status, moral standards, and parental supervision of the homes.

both parents;¹ apparently there is a tendency for a parent to acquire such a record if the spouse has one. It is highly probable that there is more defectiveness and delinquency in the parents of the boys of this study than in those of the boys of Wayne County as a whole, but the boys are not representative of the whole group but are selected on economic, national, and other bases. Nor can the causational hypothesis be proved or disproved by the outcomes on parole for it is clear that there is no necessary relationship between the significance of a factor for delinquency and its significance for reformation.² The boys whose mothers had delinquency records had a sufficient excess of failures to suggest the inclusion of this factor in the prediction table. But the number of cases is dangerously small, and it is felt that the excess might easily be accounted for by intercorrelation with other factors. This hypothesis is furthered by the fact that while there is only one case in the study in which a parent with a record could be shown to have caused the delinquency of the child, there are several in which the revulsion of the institution-trained boys against the low standards of the

¹Home visitors for both the juvenile court and the institution were vitally interested in the question of delinquencies and inadequacies of parents and this item is well reported, at least in so far as resident parents are concerned. In broken home situations the reporting on the dead or missing parent is of more doubtful accuracy.

²Thus the Gluecks, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 65, found "....20.2% of the fathers were born in the United States.....Of the white male adult population of Boston in 1920, 52% were born in the United States." Yet, ibid., p. 179, we find "Foreign born" as the "most favorable category" under the head of "Nativity of offenders." This particular relationship seems general.

³The father, a bootlegger, made the boy assist him in his operations.

home resulted in the reformation of the boys.¹ The decision was made to omit the factor from the computation of the prediction scores.

TABLE XXII
FATHERS' RECORDS

Fathers' Records	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
State Penitentiary.	1	4
House of Correction	5	7
Police court.....	1	1
Recorder's court or felony record..	1	..
County Hospital (Eloise).....	..	5
Institution for psychoses.....	2	..
Prohibition violation.....	4	..
Breaches of the peace.....	3	2
Suicide.....	1	3
Cruel and abusive..	1	2
Receiving stolen property.....	1	1
General bum, begging, etc.....	16	20
Neglect, non-support, etc.....	5	10
Venereal diseases..	3	2
Serious physical disability.....	3	1
Functional disorder	1	3
Mental inadequacy..	1	2
"Very poor heredity".....	1	..
Totals.....	50	63

¹In one case two brothers from an immigrant high delinquency area were committed after several previous delinquencies. They remained in the institution almost two years and returned to their home and continued to get into trouble until they "got disgusted" by the fact that their mother was sleeping with not one, but all four of the boarders, and left home. One stayed in Detroit and became a shop foreman and the other went to an uncle in Buffalo and was eventually ordained as a priest.

TABLE XXIII
MOTHERS' RECORDS

Mothers' Records	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
House of Correction Recorder's court or felony record..	..	4
County Hospital (Eloise).....	3	..
Institution for psychoses.....	3	1
Prohibition violation.....	1	1
Breaches of the peace.....	1	2
Suicide.....	14	15
Receiving stolen property.....	..	1
Neglect, non-support, etc.....	2	1
Venereal diseases..	3	4
Serious physical disability.....	1	..
Functional disorder	2	1
Mental inadequacy..	1	3
Prostitute and sex offender...	..	6
	1	8
Totals.....	32	47

Q. Records of Siblings

The records of siblings are in every way less informative than those of parents. The record is less complete both because the delinquencies of siblings are reported less accurately than those of parents (unfortunately children are not fingerprinted and identifications are difficult) and because only records known up to the time of the release of the inmate from the institution are included; many had siblings too young to have come to the attention of the agencies whose records were checked. There was, of course, no adequate information on the number of delinquent

siblings for all boys in either the whole area or the areas that contributed the population of this institution. Finally, there is, in the data, not even a prima facie case for claiming a relationship between delinquent siblings and eventual outcomes. The factor does not enter into the prediction tables.

TABLE XXIV
BROTHERS' RECORDS

Brothers' Records	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Ford Republic.....	24	22
Boys' Vocational School.....	7	14
Parental School....	1	1
Juvenile Home.....	29	24
Ionia (State Reformatory)...	2	3
Jackson (State Penitentiary)..	5	2
Private reform school (Father Baker's).....	..	1
House of Correction ..	..	1
Police court.....	2	2
Recorder's court...	..	1
Wayne County Training School.....	3	9
School for Deaf and Dumb.....	1	..
Charity home.....	4	2
Defects of personality....	..	2
Crippled.....	3	..
Missing from home.....	1	1
Neglected.....	..	2
Minor juvenile delinquencies..	4	1
Totals.....	86	88

TABLE XX
SISTERS' RECORDS

Sisters' Records	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Wayne County Training School.....	3	5
Adrian (State Reformatory)...	4	4
Charity home.....	5	3
Disorderly.....	4	3
Sex offenses.....	2	7
Venereal diseases..	1	..
Crippled.....	2	1
Defects of personality....	2	1
Missing from home..	..	1
Neglected.....	2	2
Totals.....	25	27

CHAPTER VII

NEIGHBORHOOD AND SCHOOL FACTORS

A. Introduction

Relatively little of the material grouped under this head is considered to show sufficiently conclusive evidence of association with outcomes to justify its incorporation in the prediction tables. However, in this group the tendency for the average success rate of all items in the categories in which only a minority of the cases were reported - thus indicating more complete social investigation - to be above the average for the whole group is even more pronounced than in the case of the family background factors.

B. General Neighborhood Rating

Success showed a slight but not at all conclusive tendency to be associated with better neighborhood ratings.¹ In the absence of ability to satisfy statistical tests for significance this category is not used in the prediction table.

¹It is recognized that this may be due to the defects of the ratings, which, like others in this study, were made on the basis of some familiarity with the areas under consideration and a careful reading of the entire record. As in the case of home ratings a definite statement of a qualified observer was accepted in the absence of conflicting data. Were the author to do another study of this type of material the classification would be in more objective terms such as used by Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 226, although it is felt that even there categories are capable of improvement in the direction of objectivity and exclusiveness.

TABLE XXVI
GENERAL NEIGHBORHOOD RATING

Rating	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Very poor.....	37	44
Poor.....	60	65
Fair.....	61	69
Good.....	47	37
Very good.....	18	18
Totals.....	223	233

C. Occupations Characteristic
of the Neighborhood

The attempt to classify business interests in the neighborhoods from which the boys came failed because of inadequate data. Five different kinds of commercial activity are noted in the case of 132 known outcomes. These background factors are so far understated as to make the results questionable, even if they did show any marked apparent relation to success - and they do not.

TABLE XXVII
OCCUPATIONS CHARACTERISTIC
OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD

Occupation	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Business.....	17	20
Industrial.....	15	15
Rooming-house.....	3	5
Warehouse.....	..	1
Railroad.....	32	24
Totals.....	67	65

D. Boys from Same Neighborhood Concurrently

An attempt was made to determine the number of other boys from the same neighborhoods in the institution at the same time and the effect of this factor on success. Results are negative due to inadequate data and the fact that for some reason, possibly the one suggested in the introductory paragraph of this chapter, all the categories were above the average success rate.

TABLE XXVIII
BOYS FROM SAME NEIGHBORHOOD
CONCURRENTLY

Number	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Few.....	15	9
Several.....	22	19
Many.....	16	12
Totals.....	53	40

E. Juvenile Delinquency in Neighborhood

Data on this category are similar to the preceding one, although in this case the success percentage for all cases on which data were available (52.4%) is a little harder to explain in the face of 171 cases. The lowest rate is 47% for those from neighborhoods of very much delinquency; the highest 61.5% for those from the least delinquent. However, the intermediary categories offer no support for the idea of a definite progression and the category is not used for prediction purposes. It will be noted that a majority of the cases are from areas of high and very high delinquency. Apparently, Detroit has much the same con-

centrations of delinquency as are shown in Shaw's Delinquency Areas.¹

TABLE XXIX
JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
IN NEIGHBORHOOD

Delinquency in Neighborhood	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Very much.....	54	61
Much.....	52	38
Average.....	13	13
Little.....	15	14
Very little.....	8	5
Totals.....	142	129

F. Gang Connections

A three-point category of "Gang membership," "Gang leadership," and "Individualist" is included. "Gang membership" is less favorable than "Gang leadership," with the highest percentage of success going to "Individualist." Only this last category, however, stands the statistical tests for significance and rates as favorable in the prediction score.

It will be noted that "Gang membership," as here defined, is not a statement of delinquency but of social habit; nevertheless, this category is definitely related to that of "Associates in delinquency for which committed" and in each table the "lone wolf" type of individual shows up as a considerably better risk than the group member. Since this is directly opposite to the findings of most other prediction studies, the reasons for the differences are discussed at some length in Chapter VIII in con-

¹Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

junction with the consideration of the problem of associates.

TABLE XXX
GANG CONNECTIONS

Gang Connection	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Gang member.....	107	49.5	109	50.5
Gang leader.....	5	55.6	4	44.4
Individualist.....	20	69.0	9	31.0
Totals.....	132	52.0	122	48.0

G. Type of School Last Attended

"Type of school last attended" is, like "Religion," definitely associated with the area and racial make-up of the Detroit working class community, but has no demonstrable relationship to success on parole.

TABLE XXXI
TYPE OF SCHOOL LAST ATTENDED

Type	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Public.....	178	180
Public special.....	7	9
Public ungraded....	22	17
Parochial.....	31	35
Polish parochial...	9	6
Others.....	4	4
Totals.....	251	251

The probability of distribution of this sort being due to

chance alone is .07 as determined by the Chi Square method, indicating that the observed distribution can not be assumed to be due to other than chance.

H. School Grade Placement

This factor is definitely related to several other considered in this study, notably: "Age at arrival," "Age at first offense," and "Intelligence quotient." The correlation of age with school grade hardly needs comment other than to mention that as in other studies of juvenile delinquents a large amount of retardation is noted (here the average is about three semesters). There is, however, no assurance that the non-delinquent siblings of these boys would show less retardation. The relationship between school grade and age at first delinquency is in large part a function of their joint relationship to age, since those who get into trouble at an earlier age tend to be committed sooner. There are undoubtedly cases in which the delinquencies, particularly truancy from school, have contributed directly to the retardation in grade. Since schooling undoubtedly influences intelligence test scores, school grade can not be assumed to be a simple function of age and intelligence; and it will be noted that while boys in the upper grades have a high rate of success, boys in the upper intelligence groups have a low rate of success.

In spite of the correlations which have been described, "School grade" is entitled to consideration as a separate factor because it is an index of maturation, training, and ability to adjust to the demands of a social situation.

Comparison of school placements with age and age at first offense led to the expectation that the higher the school grade the greater the percent of success; and though the progression is not as smooth as might be hoped for, it is apparent that the rate

for boys in the fourth grade and lower is significantly different from that for the boys in the fifth and above. This dicotomy is used in the prediction table.

TABLE XXXII
SCHOOL GRADE PLACEMENT

School Grade Placement	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
First.....	1	100.0	..	
Second.....	5	55.6	4	44.4
Third.....	20	37.7	33	62.3
Fourth.....	38	32.5	79	67.5
Fifth.....	55	50.5	54	49.5
Sixth.....	53	49.1	55	50.9
Seventh.....	51	54.8	42	45.2
Eighth.....	33	60.0	22	40.0
Ninth.....	22	62.9	13	37.1
Tenth.....	6	66.7	3	33.3
Eleventh.....	1	100.0	..	
Totals.....	285	48.3	305	51.7

CHAPTER VIII

DELINQUENCY FACTORS PRIOR TO COMMITMENT

A. Introduction

This group is notable for the high degree of completeness with which the factors included are reported in the records. The very considerable extent of the previous contacts with the agencies of the law of these juveniles is notable although probably not greatly different than would be found in the cases of juveniles committed from the juvenile courts of other large cities.

This study, like others of its kind, brings out very clearly that the age of first delinquency is of much greater prognostic value than is the particular offense for which in custody.

B. Age First Delinquency

The category of "Age first delinquency" has been suspected because of the difficulty of guaranteeing the reliability of data on this point. The combined categories of "Always" and "4 and 5 years" show a violation rate of 67%. That "Always" means almost literally that, is indicated from one mother's statement that her son gave her trouble from the hour he was born, and in another case from the fact of a police record at the age of eleven months¹ and at regular intervals thereafter.

The significance of commitment at an early age has been discussed in Chapter V. The conception of the great significance

¹He ran away and was picked up on the waterfront. This boy ran away at least once every eighteen months thereafter. At three and a half he stowed away on a passenger boat to Buffalo.

of early delinquency is reinforced by the accompanying table; apparently it is true that the younger a child starts in delinquency the more likely he is to continue in it. From "4 years" upward the rate of success increased with a consistency that was distinctly impressive. Apparently the youngest offenders are the ones most in need of treatment, although it does not necessarily follow that any existing treatment practices for very young offenders are more conducive to ultimate adjustment than no treatment at all.

For prediction purposes, a record of beginning delinquency before 10 is unfavorable; 10 and 11 are neutral; over 11 is favorable. The success rate for the age group 12-15 is only 2.7% greater than the general average but the fact of the linear trend of the relationship observed was thought to justify its inclusion.

TABLE XXXIII
AGE FIRST DELINQUENCY

Age	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
"Always delinquent".	2	33.3	4	66.7
4 and 5 years.....	2	33.3	4	66.7
6 and 7 years.....	9	39.1	14	60.9
8 and 9 years.....	22	31.9	47	68.1
10 and 11 years.....	54	47.4	60	52.6
12 and 13 years.....	60	52.2	55	47.8
14 and 15 years.....	33	66.0	17	34.0
Totals.....	182	47.5	201	52.5

C. Frequency of Delinquency

Unlike the age at first delinquency the table on "Frequency of delinquency" yields little information other than the

suggestion, borne out by too few cases to be conclusive, that those whose delinquencies are in streaks are poor risks. The data are presented in a four-fold classification¹ in the following table.

TABLE XXXIV
FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENCY

Frequency	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Continuous.....	163	172
More-or-less continuous.....	18	16
Occasional.....	28	21
Streaks.....	2	7
Totals.....	211	216

D. Number of Times in Detention Home

In line with the last point we find that the table on "Number of times in the detention home" shows no consistent or conclusive relationship to the success-failure classification. Since, in general, the assumption seems warranted that the more the individual's criminal experience the more the likelihood of his continuing in crime, the failure of this to materialize with regard to juvenile arrests (but not, be it noted, with regard to previous institutional experience) is notable. It may be that mere juvenile "pickups" are insignificant. The hypothesis that

¹"Continuous" delinquency indicates that there is evidence that the boy maintained a continuous record of delinquent attitudes and actions for some time prior to commitment; "Occasional" indicates isolated delinquent acts; "More-or-less continuous" indicates a record of a number of delinquencies scattered over a period of time with the assumption that other unrecorded delinquencies were probable; the "Streaks" classification is used to characterize those with records of a large number of crimes within two or more periods separated by intervals of apparent reform.

the institution may be relatively more effective on those with appreciable delinquent experience than on those with little experience seems dubious in view of the poor record of those with prior commitments. The alternative hypothesis that inadequacy of the data prevented the true significance of this point from being brought out is doubtful in view of the fact that these data were available on over two-thirds of the cases.

TABLE XXXV
NUMBER OF TIMES IN DETENTION HOME

Occasions	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Once.....	21	17
Twice.....	81	87
Three times.....	49	54
Four times.....	22	22
Five times.....	8	14
Six times.....	8	4
Seven times and over.....	5	7
Totals.....	194	204

E. Probation Record

Conduct on probation is rated on a five-point scale from "Very good" to "Very poor."¹ This category shows a curvilinear

¹As in other evaluative scales it is very hard to establish objective norms for material such as this, and the data must remain subjective to an appreciable extent. In this case "Very poor" indicated prompt and serious violation by new criminal acts; "Poor," occasional minor offenses; "Fair" indicated no new crimes but might include some violations of probation requirements; "Good" indicated an apparent willingness to keep the probation agreement; and "Very good" indicated a sincere attempt not only to keep the technical requirements of probation but to maintain wholesome and law-abiding attitudes. As in the basic success-failure classification, no rating was made in the absence of what was felt to be adequate data, which in this case was found for just under 46% of the cases classified as to outcome.

relationship to success with "Fair" at the highest point, and "Very good" slightly worse than "Very poor." No tenable hypothesis is known to account for this and as there is about one chance in fifty of this being due to mere chance, the category is ignored in the construction of the prediction table.

TABLE XXXVI
PROBATION RECORD

Probation Record	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very poor.....	31	41.9	43	58.1
Poor.....	76	54.3	64	45.7
Fair.....	19	59.4	13	40.6
Good.....	8	50.0	8	50.0
Very good.....	4	40.0	6	60.0
Totals.....	138	50.7	134	49.3

F. Time on Probation

Most of the boys in the Wayne County Court's jurisdiction at this period - and this is believed to be typical of American juvenile courts - had had probation before commitment to an institution. The relationship between time on probation and success seems to be a curvilinear one with those who did not last over a month on probation and those who had to be carried along two years or more almost equally poor. These categories are classed as unfavorable for predictive purposes. "Probation denied" is also classified as unfavorable on the basis of a priori assumptions and a 2.7 sigma d. deviation as well as the markedly poor success percentage noted. It is felt that the general curvilinear tend-

ency sufficiently reinforces the 2.5 sigma d. deviation of the "Three to six months" category to justify its inclusion as favorable, which is done.

TABLE XXXVII
TIME ON PROBATION

Time on Probation	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 1 month.	3	37.5	5	62.5
1 month - under 3 months	8	44.4	10	55.6
3 months - under 6 months	30	66.7	15	33.3
6 months - under 1 year..	20	47.6	22	52.4
1 year - under 2 years.	26	54.2	22	45.8
2 years and over.....	10	41.7	14	58.3
Never.....	5	71.5	2	28.5
Refused to accept probation.....	1	100.0	..	
Probation denied.....	3	20.0	12	80.0
Totals.....	106	51.0	102	49.0

G. Previous Institutional Experience

The data of this study tend to minimize the significance of such factors as previous offenses, appearances in court, broken homes, and congenital defects which have previously been assumed to be of great importance. As such factors are shown to be unimportant, the need for an explanation of the definitely unfavorable significance of the "Previous institutional experience" category as a whole increases. Apparently this explanation is found in the development of what may be called the institutionalized personality. This type is familiar to all workers in penal institutions and seems to be the result of the destruction of initiative and self-reliance by the authoritarian regime of institutional life. These people are good inmates and usually manage

to get more than their share of the institution's privileges but are lost once they are turned out on their own initiative. Not infrequently they find in the Army or Navy an acceptable mean between custodial care and real freedom.

Unfortunately, any comparable study of the semi-military, cottage plan, state institution for boys of this age group with which to compare rates and tables could not be found.¹

The category as a whole is considered as unfavorable for predictive purposes.

TABLE XXXVIII
PREVIOUS INSTITUTIONAL EXPERIENCE

Type of Experience	Number of Successes	Number of Failures
Parental home.....	11	19
Previously at Ford Republic.....	7	10
Father Baker's*.....	2	5
State Vocational School.....	..	1
Orphan home.....	4	3
Starr Commonwealth**	..	1
Home for under-privileged.....	1	4
Psychiatric defective.....	1	1
Board home.....	..	2
Totals.....	26	46

*A Catholic quasi-reform school in Buffalo.

**A co-educational institution supported at least in part by charity; not nominally for delinquents.

H. Sources from which Received

Since none of the factors in this category can meet the

¹The Gluecks's study, of course, is based on Judge Baker Foundation cases of whom only 12.1% were committed to correctional institutions, so that their cases do not represent the outcome of institutional treatment.

standard deviation of a difference test for significance, this item does not contribute to the prediction table.

The follow-up on cases other than those committed by the Wayne County Juvenile Court is poor. There is a definite tendency for such cases to become less frequent and that most of them are omitted from the group of known outcomes is probably more of an asset than a detriment to the compilation of prediction scales which will be valid for the cases following those included in this study.

TABLE XXXIX
SOURCES FROM WHICH RECEIVED

Source	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Wayne County Juvenile Court.....	275	48.8	289	51.2
Other juvenile courts..	2	50.0	2	50.0
Dependents.....	3	27.3	8	72.7
Private cases.....	8	61.5	5	38.5
Other sources.....	...		2	100.0
Totals.....	288	48.5	306	51.5

I. Delinquency Charges and Records

"Delinquency charges and records" include both the charges on which the boys were committed and, in many cases, previous records of delinquencies. The 596 boys who are classified as to outcome have 1772 charges against them, or an average of 2.97 offenses each. The 51.5% who were classified as failures contributed 53.3% of the recorded offenses; this gives some slight support to the hypothesis that reformation is less likely in those

with a greater variety of criminal experience.

In spite of the relatively complete records on this category, very little significance can be discovered in Table XL, where the charges are classified in relation to success and failure. Nor does the differentiation, in the case of multiple charges, of the record into previous offense and offense for which committed add any further discriminating enlightenment. Three categories are included in the prediction table. "Sex offenses" are considered as favorable on the basis of a priori conviction, agreement with other studies,¹ and a deviation from the average success rate so great (2.6 sigma d.) as to be improbable by chance. "Railroad larceny," which usually means taking coal from along the tracks, shows a deviation (1.7 sigma d.) which might have been due to chance, but is considered as favorable because it is not customarily considered wrong by the boys or their families and is not necessarily associated with delinquent attitudes. The "Serious felony" category, which includes murder, homicide, and gun robbery, is too small numerically to pass statistical tests for significance but is included as unfavorable on the basis of the effect of these offenses on the boy's attitude toward himself, and the community's attitude toward him. "Neglected and Dependent" might be included on the basis of its agreement with the item "Dependent" in the category "Sources from which received," but is excluded because of the very few cases involved and on the perhaps irrational ground that the institution should not be used for dependents anyway.

¹A. A. Bruce, et. al., op. cit., p. 222; Tibbitts, "Success or Failure on Parole Can Be Predicted," p. 22; Vold, op. cit., p. 34; Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 157; ibid., 500 Criminal Careers (New York: Knopf, 1930), p. 252.

TABLE XL
DELINQUENCY CHARGES AND RECORDS

Charges and Records	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Larceny charge.....	93	45.1	113	54.9
Larceny record.....	65	41.4	92	58.6
Truant from home charge	60	40.5	88	59.5
Truant from home record	43	46.2	50	53.8
Truant from school charge.....	84	49.4	86	50.6
Truant from school record.....	60	49.6	61	50.4
Incorrigible charge....	43	40.2	64	59.8
Incorrigible record....	24	48.0	26	52.0
Violation probation charge.....	108	50.0	108	50.0
Violation probation record.....	7	46.7	8	53.3
Breaking and entering charge.....	81	49.7	82	50.3
Breaking and entering record.....	23	44.2	29	55.8
Unlawful use of auto...	39	51.3	37	48.7
Railroad larceny.....	17	63.0	10	37.0
Damage; Nuisance.....	13	52.0	12	48.0
Sex offenses.....	8	80.0	2	20.0
Serious felony.....	10	38.5	16	61.5
Minor breach of peace..	3	42.9	4	57.2
Resisting an officer...	...	...	4	100.0
Not stated.....	39	47.6	43	52.4
Neglected; Dependent...	2	22.2	7	77.8
Record - nature not stated.....	5	62.5	3	37.5
Totals.....	827	46.7	945	53.3

J. Associates in Delinquency
for which Committed

It has been assumed that the question of associates in delinquency represented a single problem but an analysis of the material of this study in comparison with that of other studies indicates that the significance of the solo offense and the significance of the number of associates where there are associates

represent quite different problems.

For prediction purposes the latter problem is not difficult as Burgess,¹ Tibbitts,² the Gluecks,³ and the data here all agree that the individual who gets into difficulty with several associates is a better risk than the one who has only one or two. Apparently this is due to the fact that a group will commit an act which would not be undertaken by any of its members acting individually. The circular response through which readiness to act is built up is familiar to psychologists but has perhaps nowhere been better exemplified than in the famous fight scene in Tom Sawyer. In a group situation involving several individuals this circular response is stimulated by the increased number of contacts, and the weight of majority opinion is a very strong factor in inducing the reluctant member to comply with the majority decision. The strength of numbers is indicated by the progressively higher success rates as the group of associates increases in size.

In regard to the solo offender the studies do not agree. This study and, apparently, that of the Gluecks,⁴ find the solitary offenders good risks, while the other studies find them poor risks. Perhaps the distinction between "Alone" as favorable and as unfavorable depends on age, although Monachesi's study of probationers,⁵ the third study of juveniles, finds individual offenders poor risks.

¹Op. cit., p. 225.

²Op. cit., p. 26.

³One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 180.

⁴Ibid., p. 94.

⁵Op. cit., p. 47.

Some distinction must be made, for, while it is barely possible that the favorable success rate found here may have been due to chance, no such difference as that between this study and that of Tibbitts could have been due to chance alone.¹ It is observable that delinquents who are committed in groups tend to preserve as close association as is permitted while incarcerated. This association tends to limit the influence of the institution by subordinating institutional contacts to the demands of the old group loyalty. It follows that the improved conduct of the individualists after being in Ford Republic may be because of their greater receptivity to the citizenship building aspects of the institution's organization. Certainly one would not expect the more receptive inmates of prisons and reformatories to show improvement by reason of their increased susceptibility to prison influences. If the age group be considered the basis of distinction,² it may be said that the better success of those with associates is due to the fact that marriage and maturity break the associations that would otherwise lead to delinquency.³

For predictive purposes the categories of "Alone" and "Two," "Three," "Four," and "Five and over" are considered as favorable.

¹In this study "Alone" is 2.7 sigma d. above the mean of the whole group. Tibbitts's study shows a difference between "Alone" and the least favorable of the "Associates" categories ("One associate") of 6.8 times the standard deviation of the difference of the two percentages, with "Alone" as unfavorable.

²The hypothesis that the success of the solo offenders might have been due to association with the factor of "Offense" proved unsatisfactory as the only major difference which could be located was an 8% excess of larcenies in the records of the solo offenders. Only three sex charges were found in the group of 44, which is less than the ratio for the whole group, in spite of the supposed tendency for sex offenses to be solitary crimes.

³This category should be considered in conjunction with that of "Gang membership" discussed in the previous chapter. Ad-

TABLE XLI
ASSOCIATES IN DELINQUENCY

Number of Associates	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
One.....	40	45.5	48	54.5
Two.....	44	55.0	36	45.0
Three.....	25	54.3	21	45.7
Four.....	15	51.7	14	48.3
Five and over.....	14	82.3	3	17.7
Alone.....	30	68.2	14	31.8
With adults.....	3	75.0	1	25.0
Number unknown.....	7	38.9	11	61.1
Totals.....	178	54.6	148	45.4

mitedly the two categories overlap but they are not mutually inclusive as some individualists got into trouble with associates and some gang members were alone in the delinquencies which resulted in their incarceration.

CHAPTER IX

THE INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

A. Introduction

The thirteen items reported under the head of "Institutional factors" represent a more extensive study than has been made of institutional factors in other prediction studies; more extensive in fact than is possible from the records of most state institutions run along authoritarian lines. They are sufficiently varied so that they cover many phases of the personality, although there is undoubtedly an appreciable amount of intercorrelation.

In general, the records of the categories covered in this group are quite complete and reliable; and while, for instance, in "Sex behavior," the absence of a record does not prove that none should have existed it creates a presumption that such is the case.

Most of the categories in regard to the institution are qualitative. The five-place table from "Very poor" to "Very good" is used as standard. No special justification for the five-place table is known other than that it corresponds quite closely to the sort of ratings found in the records and that it seems to give sufficient range without getting frequencies below the point of significance in many cases.

Because the Ford Republic is very different from the typical state reform or "industrial school" in basic theory and current practice the factors taken from institution records have a special interest and a special import. The appearance of a com-

parable study of a juvenile study of authoritarian type should throw further light on the significance of institutional records.

B. Ford Republic School Record

Placement in the institution school is based on previous training and ability. It is customary to maintain a special class for the older boys who are not capable of more than sixth grade work in order to prevent their inclusion with the younger boys normally in the lower grades. This group is given special courses based upon the realization that they will, in all probability, never go to school after leaving the institution.

With variations in training and ability in any given class minimized and absenteeism eliminated, differences in school proficiency become in great part a function of the effort made along academic lines. This means that congeniality of academic work, attitude toward education, and attitude toward the institution are the basic variables of which this following table is most closely an index.

TABLE XLII
FORD REPUBLIC SCHOOL RECORD

School Record	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very poor.....	4	20.0	16	80.0
Poor.....	28	42.4	38	57.6
Fair.....	50	58.2	36	41.9
Good.....	71	55.5	57	44.5
Very good.....	57	60.6	37	39.4
Totals.....	210	53.3	184	46.7

There is a clear and definite positive relationship between academic success in the institution school and outcomes. This justifies the inclusion of the "Poor" and "Very poor" groups as unfavorable, the other three as favorable, in the prediction table.

C. Ford Republic Work Record

Ratings on work records are highly correlated with those on academic work. Only three cases in the entire thousand had "very good" school records and "poor" or "very poor" work records. The tendency for those with "good" work records to have "good" school records was not so pronounced but was nevertheless clearly demonstrable.

Good work records are, for the most part, the result of a desire to "make good" within the institution. They are also valuable as representing training in industriousness which comes in good stead after release. This is important; for, regardless of attitude, it is hard to change from the characteristic short hours at over-manned jobs in institutions to the standards demanded by industrial shops.¹

In relation to outcomes institution work records closely parallel school records; again the definite progression with a slight dip from "Fair" down to "Good" before reaching the peak at "Very good" is noted. No hypothesis is advanced to explain this phenomenon. The items in this category have the same significance in the prediction tables as the corresponding ones in the preceding table.

¹This is generally recognized in penal institutions, where it is not infrequent practice to transfer a liked and trusted inmate from a sinecure job of trust and privilege to one such as shoveling coal for a few weeks just prior to his release in order to "harden him up."

TABLE XLIII
FORD REPUBLIC WORK RECORD

Work Record*	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very poor.....	4	23.5	13	76.5
Poor.....	18	36.0	32	64.0
Fair.....	44	56.4	34	43.6
Good.....	79	54.5	66	45.5
Very good.....	75	62.0	46	38.0
Totals.....	220	53.5	191	46.5

*Some cases had copies of reports made to the judge which contained statements of work records. Such statements were accepted where they appeared and helped to set standards for the group. Records were available for many of the cases showing just what jobs had been held, degree of proficiency attained, and transfers. Classifications on this basis were admittedly subjective in that no definite norms could be set up, but it is improbable that another classifier, experienced with the routine of the institution, would differ either far or often from the classifications here.

D. Ford Republic Citizenship

The category of "Citizenship" is used to include a variety of terms characteristic of a particular type of adjustment in the citizen group of the republic. The group of "Officers," those who were elected to office in the boy republic by their fellows, shows a favorable rate too much above average to be accounted for by chance and so is included in the prediction table. To a certain extent the holding of office indicates a favorable adjustment from the point of view of the administration, since a boy must be out of debt to be eligible for office, and the officers have enough votes and influence to swing an election against an undesirable except in extraordinary cases. It is notable that leaders who were not elected to office have a less than average

success rate, though the group is too small for certainty of conclusions. The other items of the table are predominantly unfavorable, but they are few in number and highly correlated with poor court records and so are not included in the prediction table, since the categories are neither exclusive nor adequately reported.

TABLE XLIV
FORD REPUBLIC CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Officer.....	47	70.1	20	29.9
Quarrelsome.....	2	22.2	7	77.8
Unsatisfactory.....	9	37.5	15	62.5
Leader.....	5	45.5	6	54.5
"No problem".....	2	100.0	..	
Poor initial adjustment.....	1	33.3	2	66.7
Totals.....	66	56.9	50	43.1

E. Ford Republic Bank Account

In keeping with its efforts to duplicate as nearly as possible normal living conditions the institution maintains its own "bank" and currency system. As before stated, work and school work are paid for at varying scales, depending on their quality. "Bank accounts" are kept; and those who have money to their credit are given "Ford currency" which may be used to pay fines for violations of rules or to purchase limited amounts of athletic equipment, candy, and admission to shows for themselves or others. The state of the "bank account" thus becomes a composite index of

behavior, generosity, school work, occupational skill, and industry. It is interesting that it gives the most regular and consistent progression of this set of tables. For predictive purposes the first three categories are regarded as unfavorable; the last two as favorable.

TABLE XLV
FORD REPUBLIC BANK ACCOUNT

Bank Account*	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very poor.....	6	24.0	19	76.0
Poor.....	28	41.2	40	58.8
Fair.....	52	44.4	65	55.6
Good.....	99	53.5	86	46.5
Very good.....	60	66.7	30	33.3
Totals.....	245	50.5	240	49.5

*"Very poor" indicates continuous indebtedness to the institution; "Poor," intermittent indebtedness; "Fair," just enough to buy such normal privileges as weekly show attendance; "Good" indicates a surplus to cover purchase of some candy and other luxuries; "Very good" indicates a continuously high credit balance and ability to buy all the luxuries allowed and to treat friends.

F. Ford Republic Library Use

An attempt is made to establish a relationship between literary habits and future adjustment. In deciding what to include in the prediction scale the two categories "Library use" and "Type of library book read" are considered in conjunction. Library use is voluntary. Apparently any record of library use is favorable, for the success ratio for all entries in each table is above that for the whole group. The tetrachoric correlation between the presence of a record in Table XLVII and success is

.339. The presence of any record of library use is considered favorable. The types of books read are classified into two general groups: fiction and non-fiction. The habit of reading non-fiction is treated as favorable; of reading fiction as neutral.

TABLE XLVI
FORD REPUBLIC LIBRARY USE

Library Use	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very little.....	6	50.0	6	50.0
Little.....	16	43.2	21	56.8
1 to 3 books a month..	23	65.7	12	34.3
Much.....	23	53.5	20	46.5
Very much.....	48	53.9	41	46.1
Totals.....	116	53.7	100	46.3

TABLE XLVII
TYPE OF LIBRARY BOOK READ

Type of Book	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Biography.....	3	100.0	..	
School books.....	2	100.0	..	
Other non-fiction....	37	74.0	13	26.0
Nature-animal stories.	10	71.5	4	28.5
Scientific; Mechanical	3	37.5	5	62.5
Classic fiction.....	2	33.3	4	66.7
General fiction.....	15	71.4	6	28.6
Boy stories.....	29	44.6	36	55.4
Mystery stories.....	10	34.5	19	65.5
Totals.....	111	56.1	87	43.9

G. Ford Republic Boy Court Record

Discipline in the institution is administered through what is known as a "Boy court." The court records are classified on the basis of frequency and seriousness of the charges for which punished. As indicated, crimes are the violations of enactments by the citizen group. Typical offenses are "neglect of duty," "wasting state property," "fighting," "stealing," and "insolence." The court also takes cognizance of such indefinite charges as "taking advantage."¹

TABLE XLVIII
FORD REPUBLIC BOY COURT RECORD

Boy Court Record*	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very poor.....	15	19.0	64	81.0
Poor.....	35	45.5	42	54.5
Fair.....	54	46.9	61	53.1
Good.....	70	55.6	56	44.4
Very good.....	60	57.7	44	42.3
Totals.....	234	46.7	267	53.3

*The basis of classification is the same as that used in treating work records (table xliii) except that instead of work cards "court cards" containing a list of charges and punishments were available on most of the cases on which classifications were made.

Except for truancing no definite punishments are prescribed and the court works on an equity basis. Standards of punishment do develop, however, and social pressure demands equal punishment for equal offenses except that a higher standard is demanded of

¹A general term indicating abuse of position, privileges, prerogative, or physical prowess.

officers than of ordinary citizens and that certain defectives are recognized by the boys as not responsible. Appeals are possible from the boy judge to the citizens and to the supreme court (the superintendent) but reversals are uncommon and the unjustified appeal may get the appellant a more severe sentence.

Table XLVIII shows that boys who have "very poor" court records have an extremely low success rate, and that as the court record improves the success rate rises.

The institution attempts to approximate external social conditions sufficiently well that only those unable to adjust in normal society will be unable to adjust in the institution. The alternative hypothesis that failure to "make good" is the consequence of resentment for numerous punishments is a less happy one to consider. For predictive purposes "Very poor" is considered as unfavorable, "Good" and "Very good" as favorable, and the other two as neutral.

H. Ford Republic Sex Behavior

Masturbation as well as homosexuality is an offense, according to the laws of the republic, and the detection in sex offenses subjects the unfortunate one to severe ridicule as well as more formal punishment. Three categories are used: the simple masturbation case; the mild, passive, or suspected homosexual case; and the active, aggressive, or repeated homosexual offender. The rates for the first two as contrasted with the third show a difference 2.7 times as great as the standard deviation of the difference of the two percents, and as this agreed with a priori assumptions, the first two are considered as favorable and the third as unfavorable in the prediction tables.

The 14 violations recorded against those recorded as serious homosexuals included two homosexual charges and four rapes,

half the recorded post-institutional sex offenses.¹ There is no record of any sex charge against any boy in the "Masturbation" or "Questionable" groups.²

Adult parole studies all agree that sex offenders are much better than average risks and yet it is common knowledge that some individuals are apparently incurable offenders in this line. The suggestion of this data is that aggressive adolescent homosexuality may prove to be a main characteristic in the early diagnosis of these "sexual psychopaths."

TABLE XLIX
FORD REPUBLIC SEX BEHAVIOR

Sex Behavior	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Masturbation.....	16	61.5	10	38.5
Homosexuality questionable*.....	9	64.3	5	35.7
Serious homosexuality..	7	33.3	14	66.7
Totals.....	32	52.4	29	47.5

*Includes cases not proved and those of passive or coerced participation.

I. Number of Truancies from Ford Republic

Since the Ford Republic is not fenced and the boys are not under lock and key, running away is not difficult and almost a quarter of the boys have one or more truancies in their records.

¹See table lvi, p. 108.

²All cases were fully classified on institutional and pre-institutional factors before the outcomes were investigated.

Of the 167 cases of known outcomes who truanted and were returned 77 ran away only once and these had a success rate a little above that of the whole group. However, as truancies increase, the percent of success drops very rapidly. More than one truancy is considered as unfavorable in constructing the prediction tables.

Those who were never returned after their first truancy are not considered in this table but are included in the succeeding one. The "Never returned" group has a poor success rate.

TABLE I
NUMBER OF TRUANCIES FROM FORD REPUBLIC

Number of Truancies	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
One.....	40	52.0	37	48.0
Two.....	14	22.9	47	77.1
Three.....	3	10.0	18	90.0
Four and over.....	..		9	100.0
Totals.....	56	33.5	111	66.5

J. Length of Truancies

An attempt is made to determine the relation, if any, between the length of time the boy was away from the institution on his truancy and eventual adjustment. Apparently the longer the boy is free on an escape the less the chance of eventual adjustment. There are individual cases in which a boy who had been at liberty for a considerable time and had behaved in a proper manner, rebelled, when caught, at what he thought to be unjust treatment in the face of his proof that he could behave in a socially approved manner and became a definite non-conformist. There is

included in the success group a number of cases of boys who truanted and subsequently made good adjustments without being returned. The institution did not demand their return, either because they were too old or because they had made such good adjustments that it was thought desirable to leave the status quo undisturbed.

Those who were never returned were all, of course, first time truants. A few of this group have never been heard of again, but the larger proportion is made up of boys whose return was either not permitted by the court or was unacceptable to the institution. The former were boys who had been "given a chance at Ford" in lieu of more serious punishment;¹ the latter, defectives who had been accepted because the appropriate institution was too full to receive them or who had been particularly bad disciplinary problems.

TABLE LI
LENGTH OF TRUANCIES

Length of Truancies	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 11 days.....	33	44.0	42	56.0
11 - 30 days.....	10	28.6	25	71.4
31 - 60 days.....	5	29.4	12	70.6
61 - 120 days.....	5	21.7	18	78.3
121 - 365 days.....	3	20.0	12	80.0
Over 365 days.....	..		1	100.0
Never returned.....	16	39.0	25	61.0
Totals.....	72	34.8	135	65.2

¹Commitment to the Boys' Vocational School at Lansing is considered more severe punishment by the court and by the parents, although many of the boys at the Ford Republic profess to wish that they had been sent to Lansing.

The category of "Under 11 days" is so near the average that it is not significant as a predictive factor; those categories of longer periods, including "Never returned," are uniformly low and are classified as unfavorable.

K. Length of Stay in Institution

The relationship between "Time served" and outcome on parole tends to be curvilinear with the area of maximum frequency coincident with that of the highest success rate.

TABLE LII
LENGTH OF STAY IN INSTITUTION

Length of Stay	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 to 60 days.....	16	30.2	37	69.8
61 to 120 days.....	9	32.1	19	67.8
121 to 180 days.....	17	48.6	18	51.4
181 to 240 days.....	18	39.1	28	60.9
241 to 300 days.....	37	56.1	29	43.9
301 to 360 days.....	53	53.5	46	46.5
361 to 420 days.....	63	57.8	46	42.2
421 to 480 days.....	29	46.8	33	53.2
481 to 540 days.....	22	52.4	20	47.6
541 to 600 days.....	12	54.5	10	45.5
601 to 660 days.....	5	45.5	6	54.5
661 to 720 days.....	2	22.2	7	77.8
721 to 780 days.....	..		3	100.0
781 to 840 days.....	1	50.0	1	50.0
841 to 900 days.....	2	100.0	..	
901 to 960 days.....	1	50.0	1	50.0
961 to 1020 days.....	..		1	100.0
1021 to 1080 days.....	..		..	
1081 to 1140 days.....	1	50.0	1	50.0
Totals.....	288	48.5	306	51.5

The period of from "241-420 days" may be described as a stay of normal length and the factors which resulted in shorten-

ing the stay under this period or lengthening it beyond this period are predominantly unfavorable. Abnormally short stays are usually due to factors beyond the control of the institution, truantries, or action of the committing agency, although some are due to transfers of defectives who were unable to make even a passable adjustment and some to acute physical conditions. Long stays are usually due to conduct and attitude toward the institution, often complicated by other factors.¹

For predictive purposes, a stay of from "241-420 days" is considered as favorable; a shorter stay as unfavorable. With longer than normal stays the success rate slopes off more gradually and stays of from "421-600 days" are considered as neutral for predictive purposes, while longer stays are unfavorable.²

L. Reasons for Long Stay

"Reasons for long stay" are recorded for those boys who remained in the institution conspicuously over the average time.³ The number of cases in each of the sub-classes is too small to warrant including this factor in the prediction tables. However, those held a long time because of poor home conditions have a better than average success rate; and those held over-long because they have no home to go to have a success rate which is markedly under the average. Apparently a poor home is better

¹See following table.

²This is in spite of the fact that the whole category of reasons for long stay shows a favorable success rate. That category, however, starts at 501 rather than 601 days and is apparently selective in that bad home conditions are more likely to be recorded than other reasons for a long stay. Those staying over 600 days have a success rate of 37.5%.

³Even in these cases the reporting is not complete and in many of the cases there is reason to believe that the single reason assigned is only one of several. With very rare exceptions those kept for an exceptionally long time were disciplinary

than none. A stay is considered "unusually long" when it exceeds 500 days.

TABLE LIII
REASONS FOR LONG STAY

Reasons	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Home conditions.....	25	59.5	17	40.5
Home conditions and conduct.....	..		1	100.0
Attitude toward Ford Republic.....	2	66.7	1	33.3
Conflict with home....	2	100.0	..	
No home to go to.....	3	27.3	8	72.7
School attitude.....	1	50.0	1	50.0
Court requirement.....	1	100.0	..	
Ill health.....	..		1	100.0
Totals.....	34	54.0	29	46.0

M. Special Releases

The normal or usual method of demission from the institution is by court order upon recommendation from the institution that the boy in question has made good, and after investigation has shown that he has a suitable place in which to do his parole. However, a very considerable proportion of the demissions are by other means. These are grouped into various classes and compared with success. The success rate of all such demissions is distinctly below average, but the rate varies so that the treatment of the category as a unit does not seem justifiable. Three categories are found to fulfill the statistical qualifications for significance, all of them being unfavorable. These are: "Bad con-

problems, at least for the earlier months of their stays.

duct," for which boys were returned to the detention home as beyond the disciplinary limits of the institution; released as unadjusted because of "Feeblemindedness" (most of these were sent to institutions for defectives); and "Truant not returned." The latter category overlaps the group mentioned in "Length of truancies" as "Never returned" but includes in addition those cases which were not returned after a second or subsequent truancy.

TABLE LIV
SPECIAL RELEASES

Reason for Release	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Bad conduct.....	4	21.1	15	78.9
Medical treatment.....	8	66.7	4	33.3
Feebleminded.....	1	5.0	19	95.0
Family left jurisdiction of court.....	2	25.0	6	75.0
Special court order....	4	50.0	4	50.0
Private case - not adjudged delinquent	3	75.0	1	25.0
No prospect of improvement.....	3	33.3	6	66.7
U. S. Navy enlistment..	1	50.0	1	50.0
Age 17 - jurisdiction expired.....	5	62.5	3	37.5
Truancy - not returned.	23	22.8	78	77.2
Totals.....	54	28.3	137	71.7

CHAPTER X

THE POST-INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

A. Introduction

Except in the case of "Agency to which released," records for post-institutional factors were rather difficult to acquire. Detailed data are more frequently available in the cases of those individuals who had become most flagrantly and conspicuously involved with the law; the objection that this material should not have been included in a prediction study because if the study has any practical applications to the institution concerned it will be in enabling the authorities to judge the probabilities of success prior to release is met by the fact that since the cases show a widely varying number of significant factors the omission of one or more items of data is not a serious problem. It is felt that the post-institutional material would be of value in deciding on further parole supervision or reincarceration for those who had become involved in minor troubles during their parole period.

B. Agency to which Released

The most conspicuous item in the category of "Agency to which released" is the favorable record made by the boys who were released to their homes. Also favorable is the record of the boys for whom farm work jobs were secured. Those released to the detention home and to institutions for defectives have, as would be expected, unfavorable rates of success. The other items in this category are not included in the prediction table.

TABLE LV
AGENCY TO WHICH RELEASED

Agency	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Home.....	218	57.2	163	42.8
Detention home.....	5	14.7	29	85.3
Institution for defectives.....	...	...	17	100.0
Hospital.....	4	100.0	...	...
Starr Commonwealth.....	...	...	1	100.0
Relatives.....	6	33.3	12	66.7
Charities.....	2	66.7	1	33.3
Foster-parents.....	2	50.0	2	50.0
Farm to work.....	22	62.9	13	37.1
Totals.....	250	52.1	238	47.9

C. Delinquency Types after Release

As would be expected, practically all of those with recorded further difficulties fall into the class of known outcomes, and about three-quarters of these (74%) are classed as unfavorable. Of the five sub-heads in this category only one, "Truancy or petty offenses," has a favorable rating and that is not sufficiently above the average success percentage to permit of its being used in the prediction scale. The other items, "Violation of parole or probation," "Larceny, etc.," "Serious felonies" (as defined in "Previous criminal record"), and "Sex offenses" all had markedly unfavorable success percents, and are used as unfavorable items in the prediction table. Of thirteen cases of sex offense only one is recorded as making good, in spite of the fact that in "Previous criminal record," "Sex offense" is a favorable item and that at the institution only the serious homosexuals have a success rating below average. It is these institutional homosexuals

who swell the post-release sex offense group.¹

TABLE LVI
DELINQUENCY TYPES AFTER RELEASE

Type of Delinquency	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Truancy or petty offense.....	30	62.5	18	37.5
Violation parole or probation.....	2	12.5	14	87.5
Larceny, etc.....	18	23.7	58	76.3
Serious felonies.....	15	15.1	84	84.9
Sex offenses.....	1	7.7	12	92.3
Totals.....	66	26.2	186	73.8

D. Reason for Maladjustment
after Release

The category of "Reason for maladjustment" embraces 131 individuals of known outcome.

TABLE LVII
REASON FOR MALADJUSTMENT
AFTER RELEASE

Reason	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Home conditions.....	19	50.0	19	50.0
Educational difficulties.....	1	25.0	3	75.0
Maladjustment without criminal activities	6	25.0	18	75.0

¹See discussion in conjunction with table lxix. Once in court on a sex charge further commitment is almost certain.

TABLE LVII--CONTINUED

Reason	Success		Failure	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Associates in neighborhood.....	12	29.3	29	70.7
Gang leader.....	..		3	100.0
Personality and emotional inadequacy..	2	9.5	19	90.5
Totals.....	40	30.5	91	69.5

The six sub-groups of the original data are neither sufficiently large nor sufficiently differentiated to warrant individual treatment in the prediction scale. The category as a whole is considered as unfavorable.

E. Further Institutionalization

In some cases the fact of the further commitment was known prior to the boy's release from the Ford Republic. Since the fact of failure was in large part determined by the fact of the commitment, it is not felt that it is justifiable to use this table as a basis of predicting failures. It is included as an indication of the nature of the disposal of the cases.

TABLE LVIII

FURTHER INSTITUTIONALIZATION

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Failures</u>
Boys' Vocational School, Lansing.....	132
Michigan State Reformatory, Ionia.....	9
Michigan Penitentiary.....	9
Wayne County House of Correction.....	6
Other State and Federal Reformatories.....	5
Returned to Ford Republic.....	20
All other penal institutions.....	6
Institutions for dependents.....	1

TABLE LVIII--CONTINUED

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Failures</u>
Institutions for defectives.....	35*
Total.....	223

*The defective group was obviously maladjusted at the institution and for the most part was incapable of participating in the spirit and activity of the self-governing republic. It is believed that the self-government idea would have worked much better if freed from the load of the defectives. Most of them were sent to the Ford Republic only because the court felt that incarceration was necessary and the appropriate institution for defective delinquents at Northville was too overcrowded to receive them. 20 boys were released because their feeble-mindedness made adjustment with the institution impossible; 17 of the 20 were transferred directly to Northville and so make up half of the 35. Only one of the other three adjusted. The 17 who were transferred did not include all of the defectives but did include most of the more troublesome cases in which the adjustment was complicated by personality and behavior deviations.

CHAPTER XI

IS THE GROUP OF KNOWN OUTCOMES REPRESENTATIVE?

One of the major defects of this study is the fact that the "Unknown" categories are so large, particularly with regard to the fundamental success-failure distinction. While the group of unknown outcomes could have been greatly reduced by the acceptance of less rigid criteria of "Success" and "Failure" or eliminated entirely by classifying all of those of unknown outcome as "Success" (a technique that is usually employed by penal and parole agencies in their own reports of outcome), the more rigid criteria are more in the interests of accuracy. Similarly with regard to the other items of data studied the choice was made to include even those in which the information sought is available in only a minority of cases rather than to disregard what information is available.

This problem of missing data and of unknown outcomes confronts all students of parole prediction. It is less serious when current cases are used, for the missing data can almost always be obtained; it is more serious when old records are used. Because this is a general problem, an effort has been made to determine whether the known outcomes are representative of the whole group in the present study. Stated somewhat differently, it becomes a question as to the extent to which the proportion of successes and failures in the unknown group is the same as in the known group.¹

¹ The agreement of the success rate with Olson's previous

By inspection of Table LIX, it is indicated that there is an apparently selective factor operating between success and failure. The figures in the unknown column indicate something approaching a proportionate division within that group.

The following was worked out experimentally in an effort to determine whether the distribution in the unknowns was proportional to the distribution of those of known outcomes.

TABLE LIX
OUTCOME

Institutional Work Record	Success	Failure	Unknown	Dead
Very poor.....	4	13	7	
Poor.....	18	32	21	
Fair.....	44	34	52	
Good.....	79	66	85	
Very good.....	<u>75</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>50</u>	
Total known....	220	191	215	
No data.....	<u>68</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>181</u>	<u>10</u>
Totals.....	288	306	396	10
Grand Total....	1000			

As the first step a contingency coefficient was computed for the 411 cases for which complete data were available. Chi Square was found as 16.131; C. as .038 , equal to .20. Work record is selective.

The disproportionate number of unknown cases for which there were no work records was adequately explained by the marked

intensive study of outcomes from the same institution on cases released from January 1, 1912 to November 24, 1924 has already been noted in chap. iv.

tendency, shown in another part of the study, for the truants, many of whom had not been in the institution long enough to acquire adequate work records, to gravitate to the unsuccessful group. For this reason, that an entirely different type of variable was introduced, this factor was omitted from Chi Square computation, and so must similarly be omitted from further computation involving the "Unknown" group.

The next step was the determination of a hypothetical distribution of the "Unknown" under the assumption that it contains the same proportion of successes and failures as the "Known" group (omitting, as above noted, those without available work records).

The group of "Unknown" outcomes was divided arbitrarily into two groups bearing the numerical proportions of the successes and failures in the total "Known" group. Then each of these groups was subdivided in proportion to the ratios of the individual categories in the basic groups. This gave the number of "very poor" successes, "very poor" failures, etc., which would have been in the "Unknown" group, had it maintained the same proportion of successes and failures as the "Known" group, and had these successes and failures shown the same distribution of institutional records. The actual values and those expected on the basis of the above assumptions were then compared by the Chi Square method; and the results indicated a considerable chance that the assumptions might be correct.

However, the differences indicate that if the attribute be regarded as a variable no correlation would be possible by using formulas which assume a linear relationship. This suggests the hypothesis, which is considered altogether plausible, that boys with extremely good or bad institutional records are more

closely kept track of than are just ordinary ones after release. This is in accord with experience in the matter, although it had not previously been given particular consideration.

TABLE LX

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL WORK RECORDS OF THOSE OF UNKNOWN OUTCOMES WITH EXPECTED WORK RECORDS ON THE ASSUMPTION OF PROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION OF SUCCESSES AND FAILURES IN THE UNKNOWN GROUP

Category	Actual Number	Expected Number	Difference
Very poor.....	7	8.90	minus 1.90
Poor.....	21	26.15	minus 5.15
Fair.....	52	40.80	plus 11.20
Good.....	85	75.85	plus 9.15
Very good.....	50	63.30	minus 13.30
Totals...	215	215.00	0.00

Chi Square equals 8.39

With four degrees of freedom this is given a P of .068, which gives the probability of this particular variation happening by chance.*

*"If P is between .1 and .9 there is certainly no reason to suspect the hypothesis tested. If it falls below .02 it is strongly indicated that the hypothesis fails to account for the whole of facts. We shall not often be astray if we draw a conventional line at .05 and consider that higher values of Chi Square indicate a real discrepancy. P is chance or exceeding value of Chi by chance." R. A. Fisher, Statistical Methods for Research Workers. (London: Olive and Boyd, 2nd ed.), p. 77.

The minimum that may be said for this particular investigation is that, for the boys that have institutional work records available, there is no adequate reason to believe that the distribution of successes and failures in those of indeterminate outcome is disproportional in a determinable direction from the distribution of those of known outcomes.

Investigation of other categories in the same manner led to the conclusion that, in the absence of conflicting data, there

is no reason to believe that the distribution of successes and failures in the "Unknown" group is significantly different than in the "Known" group in respect to most of the categories which are studied.

CHAPTER XII

PREDICTION TABLES

The methods used to insure that the items utilized in the construction of the prediction tables are significantly related to outcome have resulted in the discarding of numerous complete categories and of numerous items under the others. The accompanying table gives the list of factors included in the prediction tables; and, for convenience, a list of the factors upon which data were gathered but which do not appear in the tables is also appended.

TABLE LXI
TABLE OF SIGNIFICANT FACTORS

Unfavorable Items	Factor	Favorable Items
9, 10, 11, 12	Age on Arrival	15, 16, 17
Up to 80 101 and over	Intelligence Quotient	
Defective psychopaths Unstable; Impulsive; Emotional; Temper Constitutional psycho- pathic personality Constitutional inferiority Simple hebephrenia Egocentric Marked introversion	Psychiatric Classification	
Inferiority habits	Defects	

TABLE LXI--CONTINUED

Unfavorable Items	Factor	Favorable Items
	Family Domestic Situation	Father dead Mother dead
Under 5 years 5, under 10 years 20, under 30 years Over 30 years	Parents' Time in the United States, if not Natives	10, under 20 years
First	Rank of Boy in Fraternity	Fourth Fifth Sixth
All others	Mode of Tenancy	Own home
Very poor	Home Rating	Fair Good Very good
	Gang Connections	Individualist
Fourth grade or below	School Grade Placement	Fifth grade or above
Under 10 years	Age First Delinquency	Over 11 years
Under 1 month Two years and over Probation requested and denied	Length of Time on Probation	3, under 6 months
Any entry	Previous Institutional Experience	
Serious felony	Delinquency Charges and Records	Sex offense Railroad larceny
	Associates in Delinquency	2, 3, 4 5 and over Alone

TABLE LXI--CONTINUED

Unfavorable Items	Factor	Favorable Items
Very poor Poor	Ford Republic School Record	Fair Good Very good
Very poor Poor	Ford Republic Work Record	Fair Good Very good
	Ford Republic Citizenship	Officer
Very poor Poor Fair	Ford Republic Bank Account	Good Very good
	Ford Republic Library Use	Any use
	Type of Library Book Read	Non-fiction
Very poor	Ford Republic Boy Court Record	Good Very good
Serious homosexuality	Ford Republic Sex Behavior	Masturbation Homosexuality
More than one	Number of Truancies from the Ford Republic	
Over 11 days Never returned	Length of Truancies	
Less than 241 days More than 600 days	Length of Stay in Institution	241-420 days
Bad conduct Feeble-mindedness Truant not returned	Special Releases	

TABLE LXI--CONTINUED

Unfavorable Items	Factor	Favorable Items
Detention home Institution for defectives	Agency to which Released	Home Farm to work
Violated parole or probation Larceny, etc. Serious felonies Sex offenses	Delinquency Types after Release	
Any entry	Reason for Maladjustment after Release	

FACTORS FOR WHICH PREDICTIVE
SIGNIFICANCE COULD NOT BE SHOWN

1. Nationality of Boys
2. Birthplaces
3. Comparative Ages of Parents
4. Number of Children in the Family
5. Children other than Full Siblings in the Family
6. Outsiders in the Home
7. Family Religion
8. Family Economic Status
9. Sources of Family Income
10. Physical Type of Home
11. Home Sanitation
12. Home Furnishings
13. Records of Parents
14. Records of Siblings
15. General Neighborhood Rating
16. Occupations Characteristic of the Neighborhood

TABLE LXI--CONTINUED

FACTORS FOR WHICH PREDICTIVE
SIGNIFICANCE COULD NOT BE SHOWN

17. Juvenile Delinquency in Neighborhood
 18. Type of School Last Attended
 19. Frequency of Delinquency
 20. Number of Times in the Detention Home
 21. Probation Record
 22. Sources from which Received
 23. Boys from Same Neighborhood Concurrently
 24. Reasons for Long Stay
-

The problem of finding a basis for prediction tables in this study presents some aspects not occurring in previous studies of prediction which have been encountered. These arise predominantly from the fact that the amount of data in the cases varies considerably. The smallest number of items known, in addition to the success-failure criterion, is four and the largest twenty-one.¹

The results of the summation of the favorable and unfavorable points in each case in both success and failure groups are presented in the two scatter diagrams which follow.

Findings of this study are presented in four general tables. One presents a prediction table based upon favorable points alone. Another is based solely upon unfavorable items; and a third is based upon the ratio between the two. A fourth

¹Tibbitts had a variable number of significant factors but his table ("Success or Failure on Parole Can Be Predicted," p. 48) leaves one in doubt as to how an individual having a score, for instance, of six favorable and eight unfavorable points should be scored. In actual practice using Tibbitts material at Pontiac this problem had to be solved. Awaiting check by experience an

DIAGRAM II

SCATTER DIAGRAM SHOWING FREQUENCY OF SPECIFIC FAVORABLE AND UNFAVORABLE POINT SCORES FOR THE "FAILURE" GROUP

UNFAVORABLE POINTS																		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Totals	

table is based on the simple numerical excess or deficit of favorable over unfavorable factors. A more complex table representing a consolidation of the first three tends to follow the same lines as the third but does not show any superiority to it and is therefore omitted. The four prediction tables follow.

The class intervals used in the tables were selected upon what appeared to be a legitimate compromise between the desire for perfectly logical grouping and the need to keep the number of categories within bounds. Anyone desiring to study the effects of different class intervals or different principles of grouping may do so by use of the scatter diagrams given.

The decision as to which table to use should depend upon conditions surrounding the intended use. Simplicity of mathematical is advisable, especially if the actual working up of the prediction scores is to be in the hands of persons with a minimum of scientific training. If this consideration is important, the tables based on favorable points alone and on unfavorable points alone are recommended. The one based on unfavorable points, because of its inclusion of post-institutional factors, is applicable only to cases which have been released from the institution. Since the only favorable post-institutional factor is in the category of "Agency to which released," it would be possible for a worker at the institution to evaluate the probability of success for any particular anticipated disposition from the table based on favorable points alone. Each of the tables so far discussed is open to the objection that it disregards the information contained in the other.

The ratio table and the one based on the difference in

arbitrary distribution was made along ratio principles.

TABLE LXII
 PREDICTION TABLE FOR FORD REPUBLIC CASES
 Based on Favorable Points Alone

Number of Favorable Points	Number Succeeding	Number Failing	Total	% Success	% Failure
0 and 1.....	..	13	13	...	100.0
2 and 3.....	9	38	47	19.1	80.9
4 and 5.....	34	90	124	27.4	72.6
6 and 7.....	74	70	144	51.4	48.6
8 and 9.....	68	59	127	53.5	46.5
10 and 11.....	49	27	76	64.5	35.5
12 and 13.....	42	9	51	82.4	17.6
14 and 15.....	12	..	12	100.0	...
Totals.....	288	306	594	48.5	51.5

TABLE LXIII
PREDICTION TABLE FOR FORD REPUBLIC CASES
Based on Unfavorable Points Alone

Number of Unfavorable Points	Number Succeeding	Number Failing	Total	% Success	% Failure
0 and 1.....	59	9	68	86.8	13.2
2 and 3.....	112	41	153	73.2	26.8
4 and 5.....	68	90	158	43.0	57.0
6 and 7.....	36	84	120	30.0	70.0
8 and 9.....	11	50	61	18.0	82.0
10 and 11.....	2	20	22	9.1	90.9
12 and 13.....	..	7	7		100.0
14 and 15.....	..	5	5		100.0
Totals.....	288	306	594	48.5	51.5

TABLE LXIV
PREDICTION TABLE FOR FORD REPUBLIC CASES
Based on Ratio of Favorable to Unfavorable Points

Ratio Favorable to Unfavorable	Number Succeeding	Number Failing	Total	% Success	% Failure
5 and over to 1.....	85	12	97	87.6	12.4
3 - less than 5 to 1.....	49	22	71	69.0	31.0
2 - less than 3 to 1.....	61	43	104	58.7	41.3
Over 1 - under 2 to 1.....	48	60	108	44.4	55.6
Even.....	12	20	32	37.5	62.5
1 to between 1 and 2.....	26	76	102	25.5	74.5
1 to over 2 - under 3.....	6	41	47	12.8	87.2
1 to 3 and over.....	1	32	33	3.0	97.0
Totals.....	288	306	594	48.5	51.5

TABLE LXV
PREDICTION TABLE FOR FORD REPUBLIC CASES
Based on Excess of Favorable Points

Excess of Favorable Points	Number Succeeding	Number Failing	Total	% Success	% Failure
12 - 15.....	28	..	28	100.0	...4
8 - 11.....	59	18	77	76.6	23.4
5 - 7.....	71	43	114	62.3	37.7
3 or 4.....	51	40	91	56.0	44.0
1 or 2.....	34	36	70	48.6	51.4
0.....	12	20	32	37.5	62.5
minus 1 or 2.....	21	57	78	26.9	73.1
3 or 4.....	10	45	55	18.2	81.8
5 or 6.....	2	20	22	9.1	90.9
7 - 16.....	..	27	27		100.0
Totals.....	288	306	594	48.5	51.5

number of favorable and unfavorable factors both have the advantage of utilizing all the available data and of being relatively little influenced by the fact of missing data. Either can legitimately be used at the institution or upon post-institutional contact. Their applicability prior to institutionalization is doubted but might well be tested. Of the two the validity of the ratio table is impinged by the tendency of the more adequately reported cases to be successful. A table based on the average score of each individual on the success, failure, and ratio basis was discarded as being unduly complicated and as offering little improvement over the basic tables.

The inclusion of the rather large categories of one hundred percent and zero success is not an unmixed blessing. The absolute categories are valuable in emphasizing the exceptionally good and exceptionally poor risks; but any one hundred percent prediction of human behavior is very dubious. The statement that "in every previous case with these characteristics the individual has succeeded" is ordinarily an acceptable antidote to the apparent arrogance of a one hundred percent prediction.

Consideration of all factors leads to the recommendation of the use of the table based on difference of favorable and unfavorable factors.

It is assumed that no agency would introduce prediction work without providing for adequate follow-up on the cases upon which prediction had been made and on the significance of the various factors used. Of course, no tests of significance are proof against alteration of that significance with the passage of time. It is expected that with the accumulation of a sufficient number of cases, prediction scores could be worked out for each particular success-failure point score.

It is recognized that in this as in other prediction studies, whether the Glueck or the Burgess method be used, the final prediction tables are a recapitulation of the tables presenting the observed relationship between the variable studied (success) and the related variables. Thus, if a sufficient number of variables, or using the Gluecks's method, sufficiently highly correlated variables were used, statistical descriptions could be arrived at which fitted one individual only; and then, of course, the "prediction scores" would be as perfect as they were meaningless. Vold¹ uses operating and control groups to test the various prediction tables he sets up but since the significance of the particular factors, as related to outcomes on parole, was determined by the data on the whole group the point of this paragraph is not touched.

Fortunately, experience at the two Illinois prisons using Burgess's material and at the one using Tibbitts's modification indicates that over a period of time the significance of the factors considered, taken as a whole, remains sufficiently stable that actual outcomes show a high correlation with predictions.²

¹Op. cit., chap. vi.

²Van Vechten, op. cit. It is expected that in actual practice prediction tables would be modified when it became apparent that changed conditions had altered the significance of a particular variable. Further, to the extent that the predictions are efficacious in causing special training, placement, and supervision for the particularly bad risks the actual violation rate for those risks will be lower than predicted.

CHAPTER XIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. The Ford Republic Material

The records of the Ford Republic were found to contain a great deal of information, a large part of which was capable of presentation in statistical form. Limitations resulting from incompleteness of data and subjectivity of statements are recognized, but it is better to present this material in conjunction with a discussion of its significance than simply to ignore it. The lack of significance for outcome of some factors is in itself significant; and numerous relationships, significant if they can be proved, are suggested. The desirability of control studies covering corresponding attributes of the general population is indicated at various points; but, perhaps more important, the need for comparison with results of a similar study of an authoritarian institution is strongly indicated.

B. The Missing Data

The data for this study were incomplete in many respects, but the problem of the missing data is not so serious a limitation as was at first supposed. All the evidence available indicates that, assuming the definitions of success and failure used, complete data on outcomes would not have materially altered the rate of success found. The definitions of success and failure would have necessitated the use of "Unclassified" as an outcome category even had the follow-up been perfect.

With a few exceptions which are noted in the text, such

as "Truant not returned," there is no reason to believe that the apparent relationship with outcome is a function of the degree of completeness of the follow-up.

The fact that the very existence of a record in certain categories is significant (the unfavorable significance of any record from the psychiatric clinic¹ and the favorable significance of records resulting from social investigations² have been commented upon) has not prevented these factors from contributing to the prediction table, while the revelation of the fact of such relationship has been most enlightening.

Finally, there is no reason why any worker attempting to apply the prediction tables given here to actual cases under consideration for release should not be able to obtain most of the items of information covered by this study.

C. Problems of Method

1. Burgess vs. Glueck method.— The Burgess method of simply counting favorable and unfavorable factors is easier in actual practice than the Glueck method of adding specific violation rates. With the significance of factors established before they are used, the Burgess many-factor method permits of the inclusion of much valuable material ignored by the Glueck method. The Glueck method requires that information be available in every case on all the factors selected for the prediction table; no such requirement is set up in the instant modification of the Burgess method.

2. Methodological criticism.— Lanne says:

In an attempt to establish parole prediction methodology as

¹Introduction to chap. v.

²Introduction to chaps. vi and vii.

very definitely a branch of science the author ventures to suggest the following four requisites which, in his opinion, must demonstrably form part of any valid prediction factor:

- (1) Reliability
- (2) Significance of association with outcome
- (3) Freedom from intercorrelation with other factors
- (4) Stability¹

It is the contention of this study that only the second of these is a necessary characteristic of a valid prediction factor, and that the significance of association with outcome of any given factor must be judged in terms of all that is known of that factor rather than by any single criterion.

In considering reliability it is recognized that in spite of the attempt to reduce most of them to objective terms, many of the categories, especially the evaluative ones, remain to a considerable extent subjective. These categories may be defended along two lines; first, that of relative reliability; and second, that of utility.

In establishing the relative reliability of the classifications the preliminary study of one hundred cases (including 75 in this one thousand), made some time before, of inmates known to the author was important in developing familiarity with the materials and clarity of classification. The reclassification of the 75 cases showed errors well within the limits of those found by Tibbitts and Monachesi, previously referred to in Chapter II.

In terms of utility it will be noted that some of the most clear associations with outcome are shown by evaluative tables such as "Ford Republic bank account"; and that, as in the case of "Home rating," a generalized statement based appreciably on subjective factors may be superior; i. e., more clearly associ-

¹William F. Lanne, Parole Prediction as Science. (Manuscript unpublished to date, July, 1935).

ated with outcome than the more objective indices that enter into it, "Sanitation," "Furnishings," and "Economic status" in the case cited.

The conclusions of this study are opposed to the contention of Lanne that social or evaluative categories showing a high degree of association with outcome must be scrapped because they lack perfect reliability in classification. In the first place, even the supposedly objective data which he would apparently prefer to use shows an appreciable amount of error;¹ in the second, as Stouffer points out:²

As to the aphorism that no study rises above the accuracy of its basic data. Like most aphorisms this is untrue. In the first place, accuracy is not an absolute but a relative term; and in the second place, an average is always more accurate than the basic data from which it is derived.

The problem of intercorrelation³ is in reality one aspect of the problem of weighting.⁴ Doubtless the ideal procedure would be to get absolutely valid data, make absolutely reliable classifications, and then go through the tremendous labor of multiple factor analysis; the results would then be perfectly valid until changing circumstances changed the significance of one or more factors. It is hardly necessary to state that there is no probability of achieving this ideal in the proximate future.

We have, then, a considerable number of indices each of which is assumed to bear some relationship to the limited number of true variables which would be revealed by the Thurstone anal-

¹See E. H. Sutherland and C. C. Van Vechten, Jr., "Reliability of Criminal Statistics," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (May, 1934), pp. 10-20.

²"Statistical Induction in Rural Social Research," Social Forces (May, 1935), p. 511.

³W. F. Lanne, op. cit.

⁴See chap. iv, sec. C.

ysis.¹ The Gluecks² in weighting by the violation rates of the sub-classes of the factors with highest contingency coefficients ignore the problem of intercorrelation, and their six factors - "Discipline by father," "Discipline by mother," "School retardation," "Conduct in school," "Age at first misbehavior," and "Length of time between onset of delinquency and J. B. F. examination" - are apparently highly correlated in successive pairs. This in reality is double weighting. The other studies discussed, including this one, give unit weight to each factor and likewise disregard the question of intercorrelation of factors, giving as indicated by Vold³ substantially the same results as the Glueck method. Lanne's objections to even this sort of weighting may be answered as follows: The factors are not perfectly intercorrelated, therefore each new factor may be said to add something to the prediction; if the factors are carefully selected there is just as much reason to believe that the double weight of the two highly correlated factors, such as "Offense" and "Sentence," is at least as valid as the unit weight obtained by using only one of them.

An attempt is being made concurrently with this⁴ to develop a basic prediction table using only "stable" factors, that is, factors found by different studies to have the same significance for outcome. This is undoubtedly a desirable procedure but it is believed that, like the problems of reliability and intercorrelation, it is susceptible to overemphasis.

Early American prisons made no distinctions as to age,

¹The Theory of Multiple Factors (Ann Arbor: Edwards Bros., 1933).

²One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 186.

³Op. cit., p. 97. He gives a scatter diagram and a correlation of .922 with a S. E. of .006.

⁴W. F. Lanne, op. cit.

sex, or reason for imprisonment. If the present segregations and classification systems mean anything we should expect to find factors such as "Age," "Intelligence," and "Previous criminal record" of different significance in different institutions. Similarly if there is any real difference between the authoritarian system of state penitentiaries and the self-governing plan of the institution under consideration here, we should expect punishment and other institutional records to vary in significance between institutions.

Further, changed conditions or changed policies outside the control of institutions may completely change the significance of a factor which had been completely stable as judged by all previous investigation. An example of this occurred recently in one jurisdiction. Previous experience had led to the conclusion in every case that Negroes were exceptionally poor parole risks, yet in the jurisdiction under consideration violations suddenly fell in rate well below that for the white group. Inquiry disclosed that the individual who determined who should be charged with violation had concluded that "crap games," policy wheels, and frequenting houses of prostitution was "part of the life of the Negro" and so was "giving many of them a break, so long as there was no suspicion of commission of a felony"; whereas whites were held to more rigid standards and returned when picked up for such things as being on the streets late nights and being caught in raids on disorderly houses. Regardless of what one may think of this realistic treatment of cultural differences between the races, it is clear that such a policy drastically alters the predictive significance of the classification "Negro" in a jurisdiction in which failure is defined in terms of official notice of parole violation.

D. General Observations

1. The value of the Ford Republic type of institution.-

It is clear that conclusions on this point are necessarily limited by the lack of available comparable data on any juvenile institution of the authoritarian type; however, a number of tentative conclusions can be advanced subject to verification:

a. The self-governing type of penal institution is applicable to a distinctly limited group of delinquents. Burgess has said¹ that it is applicable only to persons with experience with democratic forms of government. Since practically all the boys involved in this study had been brought up in American democracies this study could not test that proposition, but it does bring out other limitations.

b. The mentally defective individual, even though he is not necessarily a disciplinary problem, does not fit into the self-directive plan of things; nor does the psychotic.

c. The institution is probably more effective upon the individualist type than upon the gang boy, particularly if the latter is committed along with his erstwhile associates in delinquency.

d. The effectiveness of the institution is at maximum when the group is smallest in size and least subject to outside contacts.

e. The greater the field of institutional activities within the actual control of the inmates the greater the effectiveness of the plan.

f. Even allowing for the great differences in definition and determination of success there is reason to believe that the

¹Statement taken from lecture notes.

subsequent behavior of the individuals released from this institution is appreciably better than that of individuals released from the correctional institution available to the Boston Juvenile Court.¹ Such a comparison, of course, is the only valid basis for passing judgment on the efficacy of a particular institution (as differentiated from institutional treatment in general).

g. In view of the extremely scant evidence of the efficacy of the typical authoritarian institution the favorable records of the most active inmate participants in "self-government" - those elected to office - are an indication that, at least for this limited group, the form of the institution is helpful in developing socially acceptable conduct.

h. The proposition that the various activities peculiar to this type of institution, such as the maintenance of a fiat money system, are reformative in effect is not capable of proof from the data here. However, these activities are productive of records of demonstrable value in indicating probable successes and failures.

i. There are good grounds to believe that this type of institution, by reason of its absence of locks, bars, and walls, and its basic orientation is less effective in producing the permanent-custody-requiring "institutionalized personality" than is the traditional juvenile prison type of reform school.

2. The significance of the significance of factors.- A definite warning is needed against the confusion of the significance of particular attributes for parole and their implications

¹The failure percent of this study is 51.5; approximating the Gluecks's definition of recidivism by considering as failures all who had any subsequent recorded delinquency would give a failure rate of 67.4% as compared with the 94.4% recidivism found by them for those actually committed to a correctional institution. (One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 174.)

for crime in general. It has been customary to assume that the factors which made for crime were those that made for parole violation and vice versa; one recognized authority went so far as to suggest a prediction study intended to predict parole violation by a comparison of the attributes of a prison population and an adequate control group of the non-penal population. Aside from the extremely difficult problem of assuring the adequacy of such a control group a consideration of the data here indicates that no such study could be valid for there is no necessary relationship between the significance of a factor for incarceration and its significance for parole violation or continued delinquency. Even with the very limited data on the general population that are available it is possible to illustrate all four possible combinations of significance. Thus: "Good" neighborhoods are under-represented in the institutional population and, for those that are present, under-represented in the failure group; intelligence quotients over 100 are under-represented in the institutional population but over-represented in the failures; the "second generation" is greatly over-represented in the institutional population but, in most studies, under-represented in the failures; and finally, the Negro group is characteristically over-represented in the institutional population and over-represented in the failures.

Two specific applications of this warning may be mentioned. First, parole authorities are not justified in considering an inmate a poor risk merely because of a characteristic associated with a high commitment rate. Second, criminologists are not justified in looking to prediction studies for the delineation of characteristics of a general population which will be conducive to incarceration, except as such studies give the

Characteristics of penal populations undifferentiated to outcomes.

A thorough explanation of the lack of relationship noted here would undoubtedly be a basic contribution to criminology.

3. The concept of success.- The rate of "successes" of an organ of penal administration is a function of four variables: the efficacy of the agency, the adequacy of investigation of the cases, the time covered by the investigation, and the definition of "success" used. Of these the first is certainly the least, and the last the most important.

Particularly in these days of attack on parole and the juvenile court in favor of even more ineffective devices, no social utility is served by the adoption of a definition which paints the existing situation in the darkest possible colors. Since it is wished to determine the relationship between incarceration and subsequent behavior, a definition of success in terms of adjustment to the group of which one becomes a member is more valid than one in terms of compliance with minor statutes. In a very real sense the inmate is reformed unless he remains worse than the group to which he belongs.¹

4. Signposts for the future.- Prediction tables, in addition to their utility to sentencing and releasing authorities, may bring out points of significance for workers in other parts of this and other fields.

The data on "Age at admission," "School grade," and "Age at first delinquency" provide one of the most clear signposts. It has often been said that the first delinquency is the most important but it is worthy of emphasis that of a group of problem

¹Except, of course, in the rare cases in which all the members of those groups are as serious offenders as the one who is incarcerated.

children in school, in court, or at home the youngest members of the group are the most difficult and promise least as to eventual outcome.

In considering the removal of a child from his home, be it for delinquency, dependency, or neglect, it is well to remember that each commitment increases the probability that a subsequent one will be necessary.

The warning that the aggressive adolescent homosexual is likely to be the youthful or adult rapist is too clear to ignore. This association is well deserving of more extended and intensive study.

Apparently the gang member may simply outgrow his delinquent associations and so his criminal habits but the individual offender is much more likely to respond to treatment in childhood than after he reaches man's estate.

E. The Place of the Prediction Study

No attempt need be made here to delimit the field of the application of the prediction study technique; time and the ingenuity of coming students will do that. The earliest workers in the field of penal prediction seem to have envisaged a happy day when at every stage in the treatment of delinquents prediction studies would be available showing the probability of success under each of the possible alternative dispositions.

In the absence of any such completeness the actual experience of the State of Illinois with parole prediction along Burgess-Tibbitts lines as an adjunct to the Parole Board at each of the three institutions has contributed greatly to the concept of the place of the prediction study in actual penal management.¹

¹The Honorable John Landesco, member of the Illinois Board

It is assumed that it is the first duty of a parole board or other releasing agency to consider the protection of society as a whole. The welfare of the individual inmate is important but must remain as the secondary consideration. Unfortunately the optimistic conviction that there is no disharmony between the best interests of the individual and of the group is refuted by actual penal experience. It is out of this opposition that many of the problems of parole authorities arise.

This study and the prediction technique in general are considered not as attempts to solve the problems but to equip those who must make the decisions with this very significant information. It must be admitted, however, that in some cases the data on probability of parole violation have merely served to emphasize the dilemma facing the parole authority. Thus there is the problem of the individual who is a poor risk but who will become a poorer one if longer incarcerated. Through limitations in the sentence he must be released eventually and the alternatives are exposing society to a considerable risk now or to a greater risk at some time in the future. It seems clear that the individual for whom there is no appreciable chance of success should be detained as long as the law allows, but there are few such individuals. One parole board was recently the object of violent newspaper attack because of the parole of a man who promptly murdered another ex-convict. This man had only ninety days to serve when paroled near the termination of a one-to-fourteen year sentence.

of Pardons and Paroles, to whom belongs the greatest measure of credit for securing the adoption of parole prediction by the Illinois legislature, has presented the practical aspects of parole prediction from the point of view of the authority with the ultimate responsibility for granting, deferring, or refusing paroles in an address before the American Sociological Society at its 1934 convention in Chicago.

The prediction study showed this man as a decidedly poor but not absolutely hopeless risk. The parole board was faced with the question whether society would be afforded better protection in this case by releasing him under conditions designed to produce a law-abiding, social, and economic adjustment, though with the added risk of the ninety days earlier release; or by holding him to the very end of his time when, because his sentence had expired and no parole supervision could be exercised over him, he must simply be turned out with ten dollars and a railway ticket. It is not clear that the fact that this individual did not make an adjustment is a reflection on the judgment of the authority which permitted the parole.

It may be well to indicate the bearing of prediction reports on some of the other important considerations with which a parole authority is faced. One is the fact that the maintenance of institutional morale and any belief on the part of the inmate group in the honesty of the parole authority demands the establishment of some standards of punishment, offense and previous criminal record being the variables recognized by inmate opinion as having a legitimate bearing on the amount of time given. If the decision is made that the offense and record demand that more time be served, the prediction report is not logically an index of how much more time. It is well to bear in mind that public and judicial opinion is antagonistic, in practical cases, to the permanent incarceration of relatively minor offenders regardless of the probability of recidivism; so that a parole board giving very long terms in such cases finds its power removed by the use of "lesser pleas" and consequent sentences not permitting of long incarceration.

The practical influence of prediction reports is to em-

phasize aspects of case records which might otherwise go unnoticed, to check on unscientific conceptions of the significance for further crime of particular factors, and to provide justifications for the early release of a limited number of individuals who are very good risks although serving for serious crimes and for the relatively long incarceration of a number of very poor risks who are serving for less seriously regarded crimes. They are also important in that more rigid scrutiny of work and home conditions is made in the case of the poorer risks and they are given more intensive supervision.

It is hoped that this study will have practical applications in that it will enable Ford Republic authorities more completely to understand the nature of their problems and that it will aid court and parole officers in understanding the probable implications of various alternatives of treatment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bruce, A. A., Burgess, E. W., Harno, A. J., and Landesco, John. Parole and the Indeterminate Sentence. Springfield: State of Illinois, 1928.
- Clark, W. W. "Success Records of Prisoners and Delinquents," Journal of Delinquency, VI (July, 1921), pp. 443-52.
- Fernald, Mabel R., Hayes, M. H. S., and Dawlet, A. A Study of Women Delinquents in New York State. New York: Century Co., 1920.
- Fisher, Ronald A. Statistical Methods for Research Workers. 2nd ed. London: Olive and Boyd, 1928.
- Fouille, A. J. Education from a National Standpoint. Translation. New York: D. Appleton Co., 1897.
- George, William R., and Stowe, L. B. Citizens Made and Remade. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1912.
- Glueck, Sheldon, and Glueck, Eleanor T. 500 Criminal Careers. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930.
- _____. Five Hundred Delinquent Women. New York: Knopf, 1934.
- _____. One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Hart, Hornell. "Predicting Parole Success," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XIV (November, 1923), pp. 405-14.
- Healy, William. The Individual Delinquent. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1915.
- Judge Baker Foundation. Case Studies. Boston: Judge Baker Foundation, 1922 et seq.
- Lanne, William F. Parole Prediction as Science. Unpublished manuscript.
- Laune, Ferris F. A Technique for Developing Criteria of Parolability. Unpublished manuscript accepted by Northwestern University in candidacy for degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 1935.
- Monachesi, E. D. Prediction Factors in Probation. Hanover: Sociological Press, 1932.
- Ranson, S., Van Vechten, C. C., Jr., and Lang, R. Analysis of Juvenile Delinquency Correlations. Unpublished manuscript.

- Shaw, Clifford. Delinquency Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- _____, and McKay, H. D. "Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency," in National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Report on the Causes of Crime, II, Washington: 1932.
- Stouffer, Samuel A. "Statistical Induction in Rural Social Research," Social Forces, XIII (May, 1935), pp. 505-15.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. Principles of Criminology. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1934.
- _____, and Van Vechten, C. C., Jr. "The Reliability of Criminal Statistics," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XXV (May-June, 1934), pp. 10-20.
- Thurstone, L. L. The Theory of Multiple Factors. Ann Arbor: Edwards Bros., 1933.
- Tibbitts, Clark. "Reliability of Factors Used in Predicting Success or Failure on Parole," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XXII (March, 1932), pp. 844-53.
- _____. "Success or Failure on Parole Can Be Predicted," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XXII (May, 1931), pp. 11-50.
- Van Vechten, C. C., Jr. Parole Prediction: Problems of Reliability and Follow-up. MS. of paper delivered before the American Sociological Society on December 29, 1934.
- Vold, George B. Prediction Methods and Parole. Hanover: Sociological Press, 1931.
- Warner, S. B. "Factors Determining Parole from the Massachusetts Reformatory," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, V (August, 1923), pp. 172-207.
- Williams, J. H. "The Whittier Scale for Grading Home Conditions," Journal of Delinquency, I (November, 1916), pp. 273-86.

APPENDIX A

BASIC DATA

The following tabulation is presented in order to indicate the amount of information available on the various items studied regardless of the question of predictive significance. The column indicating the total distribution for each item is of value as presenting a statistical description of a penal population, quite apart from the possible significance of the factor concerned as a prognostic item.

No percentages are given because of the danger of under-emphasizing the importance of the number of cases included.

TABLE LXVI

TABLE SHOWING NUMBER IN EACH OUTCOME CLASSIFICATION
FOR THE SUB-CLASSES IN EACH CATEGORY CONSIDERED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>1. Age (Nearest Year) at Arrival</u>				
9.....	1	..	1	2
10.....	3	5	5	13
11.....	16	29	28	73
12.....	30	54	53	137
13.....	51	46	77	174
14.....	64	79	96	239
15.....	70	56	92	218
16.....	49	33	50	132
17.....	4	3	4	11
Unknown.....	..	1	..	1
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>2. Nationality of Boys</u>				
Polish.....	106	110	130	346
American White.....	52	45	88	190
Italian.....	23	24	29	76
German.....	13	15	24	52
Irish.....	4	8	10	22
Hungarian.....	3	7	6	16
Canadian.....	4	6	3	13
Syrian.....	4	4	5	13
Lithuanian.....	6	2	4	12
English.....	2	3	5	10
Austrian.....	2	4	4	10
French.....	2	4	3	9
Roumanian.....	4	1	4	9
Greek.....	4	1	4	9
Serbian.....	2	4	3	9
Russian.....	3	3	1	7
Ukrainian.....	1	1	5	7
Slovene.....	2	2	3	7
Scotch.....	1	3	2	6
Armenian.....	1	3	2	6
Other Foreign.....	7	6	7	20
Jewish.....	10	10	9	29
Negro and Indian.....	12	13	38	63
Mixed American and Foreign.....	9	14	16	39
Mixed Foreign.....	11	11	10	32
No data.....	..	2	1	3
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>3. Boys' Birthplaces</u>				
Michigan.....	26	25	48	99
Detroit.....	125	144	141	410
United States.....	30	30	52	112
Pennsylvania.....	21	17	14	52
New York.....	10	7	19	36
New Jersey.....	1	1	3	5
District of Columbia...	..	1	..	1
Massachusetts.....	1	1	3	5
New Hampshire.....	..	1	1	2
Connecticut.....	1	1	1	3
Rhode Island.....	..	1	..	1
Ohio.....	6	6	18	30
Illinois.....	6	11	13	30
Indiana.....	1	2	3	6

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
3. <u>Boys' Birthplaces</u> (continued)				
Wisconsin.....	6	2	1	9
Missouri.....	1	3	4	8
Minnesota.....	..	..	2	2
North Dakota.....	..	..	1	1
Iowa.....	1	..	1	2
Nebraska.....	..	1	..	1
Kentucky.....	2	2	7	11
West Virginia.....	1	3	4	8
Tennessee.....	3	1	4	8
Georgia.....	..	2	6	8
South Carolina.....	..	1	3	4
Alabama.....	1	..	2	3
Texas.....	2	..	..	2
North Carolina.....	1	1	..	2
Delaware.....	..	1	..	1
Mississippi.....	..	..	2	2
Arkansas.....	..	1	..	1
Florida.....	..	..	1	1
Oklahoma.....	..	1	..	1
Louisiana.....	..	..	1	1
Oregon.....	..	1	1	2
California.....	..	1	..	1
Montana.....	..	..	1	1
Colorado.....	..	..	1	1
Canada.....	9	10	10	29
Poland.....	12	8	9	29
Italy.....	8	4	1	13
England.....	2	2	2	6
Germany.....	2	1	1	4
Russia.....	2	1	1	4
Austria.....	1	1	1	3
Jugoslavia.....	1	1	1	3
Hungary.....	2	..	1	3
Malta.....	..	1	1	2
Armenia.....	..	1	1	2
Scotland.....	..	2	..	2
Ukraine.....	..	..	1	1
Belgium.....	..	..	1	1
Denmark.....	..	..	1	1
Greece.....	..	..	1	1
Syria.....	1	..	..	1
No data.....	1	5	15	21
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>4. Intelligence Quotient</u>				
41- 50.....	1	1	..	2
51- 60.....	3	10	6	19
61- 70.....	10	32	21	63
71- 80.....	15	37	51	103
81- 90.....	18	26	40	84
91-100.....	16	14	29	59
101-110.....	6	8	5	19
111-120.....	1	3	2	6
No data.....	218	175	252	645
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>5. Psychiatric Classification</u>				
Defective psychopath...	1	4	6	11
Unstable; Impulsive; Emotional; Temper...	4	8	7	19
Infantile; Neurotic; Sensitive.....	9	8	24	41
Constitutional inferiority; Defective....	3	7	3	13
Constitutional psychopathic personality..	..	4	6	10
Marked extroversion....	2	2	2	6
Marked introversion....	1	3	3	7
Egocentric personality.	2	3	8	13
Simple hebephrenia.....	2	7	7	16
Conflicts.....	1	1	6	8
Traumatopsychosis.....	1	..	..	1
None available.....	262	259	334	855
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>6. Defects Noted on Medical Examination</u>				
Sensory organs.....	4	3	5	12
Neural structure.....	6	3	4	13
Minor physiological....	10	9	23	42
Major physiological....	4	6	2	12
Diseases.....	7	5	9	21
Stigmata.....	1	1	2	4
Glandular.....	1	5	2	8
Inferiority habits.....	2	9	16	27
None recorded.....	253	265	343	861
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>7. Domestic Situation</u>				
Father dead.....	26	17	24	67
Mother dead.....	23	16	33	72
Divorced - custody to father.....	5	10	11	26
Divorced - custody to mother.....	17	19	20	56
Living with relatives...	11	18	17	46
Separated - custody to father.....	3	4	8	15
Separated - custody to mother.....	6	6	13	25
Father deserted.....	9	7	6	22
Mother deserted.....	..	4	1	5
Maintained by charities.	3	2	7	12
Stepfather.....	24	34	31	89
Stepmother.....	23	25	35	83
"Normal" or No data.....	138	144	200	482
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>8. Comparative Ages of Parents</u>				
Mother older than father	17	16	12	45
Parents same age.....	19	10	21	50
Father 1-10 years older.	100	106	136	342
Father over 10 years older.....	16	20	13	49
No data.....	136	154	224	514
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>9. Rank of Boy in Fraternity</u>				
First.....	82	102	115	299
Second.....	77	84	89	250
Third.....	50	52	55	157
Fourth.....	32	27	44	103
Fifth.....	19	14	16	49
Sixth.....	9	6	12	27
Seventh.....	2	5	6	13
Eighth.....	1	..	3	4
Ninth.....	1	1	1	3
No data.....	15	15	65	95
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>10. Number of Children in Family</u>				
Only child.....	19	42	34	95
Two.....	44	45	65	154
Three.....	49	47	52	148
Four.....	50	53	70	173
Five.....	37	36	41	113
Six.....	29	24	24	77
Seven.....	13	14	15	42
Eight.....	10	12	13	35
Nine.....	4	5	7	16
Ten.....	2	3	..	5
Eleven.....	1	..	3	4
Twelve.....	2	..	1	3
No data.....	47	68	115	230
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>11. Children other than Full Siblings in Family</u>				
Half-siblings.....	19	19	21	59
Step-brothers or sisters	4	6	9	19
Foster-brothers or sisters.....	1	3	2	6
Half- and step-brothers or sisters.....	4	6	5	15
Step- and foster-brother.....	..	1	..	1
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>12. Outsiders in the Home</u>				
Roomers.....	29	33	31	93
Resident relatives.....	20	19	32	71
Roomers and relatives...	3	3	2	8
Servants and roomers....	1	2	2	5
Co-operative families...	1	1	1	3
Others.....	..	1	1	2
None recorded.....	234	247	337	818
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>13. Family Religion</u>				
Roman Catholic.....	154	170	179	503
Protestant.....	72	78	107	257
Orthodox.....	11	8	10	29
Jewish.....	9	9	8	26
Christian Science.....	1	1	1	3
Moslem.....	..	..	2	2
No data.....	41	40	99	180
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>14. Parents' Time in the United States, if not Natives</u>				
Under 5 years.....	3	7	1	11
5, under 10 years.....	7	11	9	27
10, under 20 years.....	122	106	122	350
20, under 30 years.....	37	48	53	138
Over 30 years.....	17	23	21	61
Native or No data.....	102	111	200	413
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>15. Family Economic Status</u>				
Very poor.....	18	21	21	60
Poor.....	40	52	57	149
Fair.....	33	41	53	127
Good.....	68	56	58	182
Very good.....	9	12	15	36
No data.....	120	124	202	446
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>16. Sources of Family Income</u>				
Father at Ford plant....	51	47	60	158
Father at other auto plants.....	22	22	17	61
Father at shops; \$25-\$42	37	54	56	147
Father laborer; under \$25.....	33	31	37	101
Father independent or over \$42.....	51	48	69	168
Father Public Welfare Department.....	3	2	..	5
Mother at Ford plant....	1	2	4	7

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>16. Sources of Family Income (continued)</u>				
Mother at other auto plants.....	3	2	1	6
Mother at shops; \$25-\$42	11	6	11	28
Mother laborer; under \$25.....	21	25	31	77
Mother independent or over \$42.....	28	23	48	99
Mother Public Welfare Department.....	22	16	10	48
No data.....	5	28	62	95
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>17. Physical Type of Home</u>				
Frame.....	161	164	188	513
Multiple family frame...	53	49	66	168
Flats, or with stores...	22	15	25	62
Apartments.....	12	13	17	42
Brick houses.....	9	12	1	22
Miscellaneous.....	1	..	10	11
No data.....	30	53	99	182
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>18. Mode of Tenancy</u>				
Own home.....	155	140	163	458
Rent home.....	97	126	130	353
Rent furnished rooms...	7	6	7	20
Room and board.....	..	2	5	7
Quarters for service...	3	5	2	10
Gratis tenants.....	..	..	2	2
No data.....	26	27	97	150
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>19. Home Sanitation</u>				
Very poor.....	24	18	27	69
Poor.....	35	38	47	120
Fair.....	65	84	92	241
Good.....	119	110	128	357
Very good.....	20	17	13	50
No data.....	25	39	99	163
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>20. Home Furnishings</u>				
Very poor.....	10	4	12	26
Poor.....	42	48	40	130
Fair.....	41	35	42	118
Good.....	77	61	78	216
Very good.....	12	8	11	31
No data.....	106	150	223	479
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>21. Home Rating</u>				
Very poor.....	39	46	58	143
Poor.....	58	64	90	212
Fair.....	66	60	55	181
Good.....	58	49	52	159
Very good.....	17	13	18	48
No data.....	50	74	133	257
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>22. Fathers' Records</u>				
State Penitentiary.....	1	4	2	7
House of Correction.....	5	7	9	21
Police court record.....	1	1	2	4
Recorder's court or felony record.....	1	..	1	2
County Hospital (Eloise) Institution for psychoses.....	..	5	1	6
Prohibition violation...	2	..	3	5
Breaches of the peace...	4	..	7	11
Suicide.....	3	2	6	11
Cruel and abusive.....	1	3	..	4
Receiving stolen property.....	1	2	4	7
General bum, begging, etc.....	1	1	..	2
Neglect, non-support, etc.....	16	20	19	55
Venereal diseases.....	5	10	14	29
Serious physical disability.....	3	2	1	6
Functional disorder.....	3	1	4	8
Mental inadequacies.....	1	3	3	7
"Very poor heredity"....	1	2	3	6
	1	..	..	1

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
22. <u>Fathers' Records</u> (continued)				
None recorded.....	238	243	327	808
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
23. <u>Mothers' Records</u>				
House of Correction.....	..	4	1	5
Recorder's court or felony record.....	3	..	4	7
County Hospital (Eloise) Institution for psychoses.....	3	1	..	4
Prohibition violation...	1	1	2	4
Breaches of the peace...	1	2	5	8
Suicide.....	14	15	14	43
Receiving stolen property.....	..	1	3	4
Neglect, non-support, etc.....	2	1	..	3
Veneereal diseases.....	3	4	9	16
Serious physical disability.....	1	..	2	3
Functional disorders....	2	1	..	3
Mental inadequacies.....	1	3	11	15
Juvenile court.....	..	6	..	6
Lapeer State Hospital...	..	..	1	1
Prostitute and sex offender.....	..	..	1	1
None recorded.....	1	8	4	13
Totals.....	256	259	349	864
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
24. <u>Brothers' Records</u>				
Ford Republic.....	24	22	11	57
Boys' Vocational School.	7	14	11	32
Parental school.....	1	1	1	3
Juvenile home.....	29	24	31	84
Ionia (State Reformatory)	2	3	6	11
Jackson (State Peni- tentiary).....	5	2	1	8
Father Baker's.....	..	1	2	3
House of Correction.....	..	1	1	2
Police court record.....	2	2	1	5
Recorder's court record.	..	1	1	2
Charity home.....	4	2	8	14

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>24. Brothers' Records (continued)</u>				
Wayne County Training				
School.....	3	9	4	16
School for Deaf and Dumb	1	..	..	1
Felony charges.....	..	..	2	2
Crippled.....	3	..	1	4
Defects of personality..	..	2	1	3
Missing from home.....	1	1	1	3
Neglected.....	..	2	1	3
Minor juvenile delinquencies.....	4	1	3	8
None recorded.....	202	218	319	739
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>25. Sisters' Records</u>				
Adrian; House of the Good Shepherd; Girls Protective League....	4	4	4	12
Fairmont Hospital (venereal).....	..	..	1	1
Lapeer State Hospital...	3	5	2	10
Charity home.....	5	3	5	13
Disorderly.....	4	3	3	15
Sex offenses.....	2	7	5	14
Venereal diseases.....	1	..	3	4
Crippled.....	2	1	..	3
Defects of personality..	2	1	3	6
Missing from home.....	..	1	3	4
Neglected.....	2	2	1	5
None recorded.....	263	279	371	913
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>26. General Neighborhood Rating</u>				
Very poor.....	37	44	43	124
Poor.....	60	65	73	198
Fair.....	61	69	80	210
Good.....	47	37	48	132
Very good.....	18	18	16	52
Change Board homes for delinquency.....	1	1	2	4
Rapid movements.....	..	1	2	3
Various board homes.....	1	1	1	3
Mother's employer.....	..	..	2	2

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>26. General Neighborhood Rating (continued)</u>				
No home.....	..	..	1	1
No record.....	63	70	138	271
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>27. Occupations Characteristic of the Neighborhood</u>				
Business.....	17	20	24	61
Industrial.....	15	15	11	41
Rooming-house.....	3	5	1	9
Warehouse.....	..	1	..	1
Railroad.....	32	24	25	81
No record.....	221	241	345	807
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>28. Boys from Same Neighborhood Concurrently</u>				
Few.....	15	9	17	41
Several.....	22	19	34	75
Many.....	16	12	17	45
No record.....	235	266	338	839
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>29. Delinquency in Neighborhood</u>				
Very much.....	54	61	68	183
Much.....	52	36	54	142
Average.....	13	13	10	36
Little.....	15	14	13	43
Very little.....	8	5	6	19
No record.....	146	177	255	578
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>30. Gang Connections</u>				
Gang member.....	107	109	114	330
Gang leader.....	5	4	5	14
Individualist.....	20	9	15	44
No record.....	156	184	272	612
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>31. Type of School Last Attended</u>				
Public.....	178	180	218	576
Public special.....	7	9	15	31
Public ungraded.....	22	17	27	66
Parochial.....	31	35	36	102
Polish parochial.....	9	6	15	30
Others.....	4	4	9	17
No data.....	37	55	86	178
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>32. School Grade Placement</u>				
First.....	1	..	..	1
Second.....	5	4	4	13
Third.....	20	33	27	80
Fourth.....	38	79	53	171
Fifth.....	55	54	78	187
Sixth.....	53	55	56	164
Seventh.....	51	42	82	175
Eighth.....	33	22	40	95
Ninth.....	22	13	27	62
Tenth.....	6	3	5	14
Eleventh.....	1	..	..	1
No data.....	3	1	33	37
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>33. Age First Delinquency</u>				
"Always delinquent"..	2	4	4	10
4 and 5 years.....	2	4	4	10
6 and 7 years.....	9	14	5	28
8 and 9 years.....	22	47	24	93
10 and 11 years.....	54	60	71	185
12 and 13 years.....	60	55	74	189
14 and 15 years.....	33	17	20	70
No data.....	106	105	204	415
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>34. Frequency of Delinquency</u>				
Continuous.....	163	172	174	509
Occasional.....	28	21	33	82
More-or-less continuous.....	18	16	26	60

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>34. Frequency of Delinquency (continued)</u>				
Streaks.....	2	7	8	17
No data.....	77	90	165	332
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>35. Number of Times in Detention Home</u>				
Once.....	21	17	24	62
Twice.....	81	87	108	276
Three times.....	49	54	56	159
Four times.....	22	22	20	64
Five times.....	8	14	16	38
Six times.....	8	4	6	18
Seven or more times.....	5	7	3	15
No data.....	94	101	173	368
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>36. Probation Record</u>				
Very poor.....	31	43	34	108
Poor.....	76	64	65	205
Fair.....	19	13	20	52
Good.....	8	8	14	30
Very good.....	4	6	2	12
No data.....	150	172	271	593
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>37. Time on Probation</u>				
Under 1 month..	3	5	7	15
1 month -under 3 months..	8	10	12	30
3 months-under 6 months..	30	15	20	65
6 months-under 1 year...	20	22	32	74
1 year -under 2 years..	26	22	32	80
2 years and over.....	10	14	8	32
Never.....	5	2	8	15
Refused to accept probation.....	1	..	1	2
Probation requested and denied.....	3	12	25	40
No data.....	182	204	261	647
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI---CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>38. Previous Institutional Experience</u>				
Parental home.....	11	19	9	39
Previously at Ford				
Republic.....	7	10	13	30
Father Baker's.....	2	5	4	11
State Vocational School.	..	1	3	4
Orphan home.....	4	3	11	18
Starr Commonwealth.....	..	1	..	1
Home for underprivileged	1	4	1	6
Psychiatric defective...	1	1	2	4
Board home.....	..	2	..	2
None recorded.....	262	260	363	885
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>39. Sources from which Received</u>				
Wayne County.....	275	289	336	900
Oakland County.....	1	1	18	20
Ingham County.....	1	..	1	2
Saginaw County.....	..	..	1	1
Macomb County.....	..	1	..	1
Lucas County, Ohio.....	..	..	1	1
Neglect cases.....	3	8	16	27
Private cases.....	8	5	30	43
Committed after entry as				
private case.....	..	1	1	2
Error by detention home-				
waif.....	..	1	2	3
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>40. Delinquency Charges and Records</u>				
Larceny charge.....	93	113	136	342
Larceny record.....	65	92	94	251
Truant from home charge.	60	88	102	250
Truant from home record.	43	50	45	138
Truant from school				
charge.....	84	86	98	278
Truant from school				
record.....	60	61	77	198
Incorrigible charge.....	43	64	75	182
Incorrigible record.....	24	26	39	89
Violation probation				
charge.....	108	108	129	345

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>40. Delinquency Charges and Records (continued)</u>				
Violation probation record.....	7	8	19	34
Breaking and entering charge.....	81	82	88	251
Breaking and entering record.....	23	29	37	89
Unlawful use of auto....	39	37	46	122
Railroad larceny.....	17	10	9	36
Damage; Wilful destruction.....	13	12	12	37
Sex offenses.....	8	2	2	12
Serious felonies.....	10	16	14	40
Minor breaches of peace.	3	4	1	8
Resistance to authority.	..	4	7	11
Not stated.....	39	43	3	85
Violation of parole.....	..	..	3	3
Neglected; Dependent....	2	7	18	27
Record - nature not stated.....	5	3	13	21
Totals.....	827	945	1063	2835
<u>41. Associates in Delinquency</u>				
One.....	40	48	54	142
Two.....	44	36	46	126
Three.....	25	21	26	72
Four.....	15	14	6	35
Five.....	3	1	11	15
Six.....	4	1	3	8
Seven.....	2	..	3	5
Eight or Nine.....	3	1	..	4
Twelve or Thirteen.....	2	..	1	3
Alone.....	30	14	28	72
With adults.....	3	1	5	9
Number unknown.....	7	11	5	23
No data.....	110	158	218	486
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>42. Ford Republic School Record</u>				
Very poor.....	4	16	7	27
Poor.....	28	38	31	97
Fair.....	50	36	45	131
Good.....	71	57	63	191

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>42. Ford Republic School Record (continued)</u>				
Very good.....	57	37	27	121
No data.....	78	122	233	433
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>43. Ford Republic Work Record</u>				
Very poor.....	4	13	7	24
Poor.....	18	32	21	71
Fair.....	44	34	52	130
Good.....	79	66	85	230
Very good.....	75	46	50	171
No data.....	68	115	191	374
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>44. Ford Republic Citizenship</u>				
Officer.....	47	20	31	98
Quarrelsome.....	2	7	4	13
Unsatisfactory.....	9	15	2	26
Leader.....	5	6	3	14
"No problem".....	2	..	..	2
Poor initial adjustment.	1	2	2	5
Trouble with new boys...	..	..	1	1
No data.....	222	256	363	841
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>45. Ford Republic Bank Account</u>				
Very poor.....	6	19	17	42
Poor.....	28	40	39	107
Fair.....	52	65	62	179
Good.....	99	86	97	282
Very good.....	60	30	45	135
No data.....	43	66	146	255
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>46. Ford Republic Library Use</u>				
Very little.....	6	6	11	23
Little.....	16	21	18	55

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>46. Ford Republic Library Use (continued)</u>				
Average.....	23	12	28	63
Much.....	23	20	27	70
Very much.....	48	41	47	136
No data.....	172	206	275	653
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>47. Type of Library Book Read</u>				
Biography.....	3	..	1	4
School books.....	2	..	1	3
Other non-fiction.....	37	13	45	95
Classic fiction.....	2	4	1	7
General fiction.....	15	6	15	36
Boy stories.....	29	36	28	93
Mystery stories.....	10	19	14	43
Nature - animal stories..	10	4	10	24
Scientific; Mechanical..	3	5	6	14
No data.....	177	219	285	681
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>48. Ford Republic Boy Court Record</u>				
Very poor.....	15	64	24	103
Poor.....	35	42	28	105
Fair.....	54	61	76	191
Good.....	70	56	61	187
Very good.....	60	44	57	161
No data.....	54	39	160	253
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>49. Ford Republic Sex Behavior</u>				
Masturbation.....	16	10	11	37
Homosexuality question- able.....	9	5	8	22
Serious homosexuality...	7	14	5	26
None recorded.....	256	277	382	915
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>50. Number of Truancies from Ford Republic</u>				
One.....	40	37	31	108
Two.....	14	47	27	88
Three.....	2	18	13	33
Four and over.....	..	9	5	14
Never returned after first truancy.....	16	25	57	98
None recorded.....	216	170	273	659
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>51. Length of Truancies from Ford Republic</u>				
Under 11 days.....	33	42	27	102
11- 30 days.....	10	25	9	44
31- 60 days.....	5	12	14	31
61-120 days.....	5	18	12	35
121-365 days.....	3	12	10	25
Over 365 days.....	..	1	1	2
Never returned.....	16	25	57	98
No data.....	216	171	276	663
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>52. Length of Stay in Institution</u>				
1- 60 days.....	16	37	72	125
61- 120 days.....	9	19	25	63
121- 180 days.....	17	18	32	67
181- 240 days.....	18	28	33	79
241- 300 days.....	37	29	41	107
301- 360 days.....	53	46	34	133
361- 420 days.....	63	46	35	144
421- 480 days.....	29	33	33	95
481- 540 days.....	22	20	34	76
541- 600 days.....	12	10	10	32
601- 660 days.....	5	6	6	17
661- 720 days.....	2	7	3	12
721- 780 days.....	..	3	3	6
781- 840 days.....	1	1	3	5
841- 900 days.....	2	..	1	3
901- 960 days.....	1	1	1	3
961-1020 days.....	..	1	..	1
1021-1080 days.....	..	..	1	1
1081-1140 days.....	1	1	..	2

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>52. Length of Stay in Institution (continued)</u>				
No data or still in institution.....	..	..	39	39
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>53. Reasons for Long Stay</u>				
Home conditions.....	25	17	15	57
Home conditions and conduct.....	..	1	5	6
Attitude toward Ford Republic.....	2	1	4	7
Conflicts with home.....	2	..	..	2
School attitude.....	1	1	2	4
No home to go to.....	3	8	8	19
Court requirement.....	1	..	1	2
Ill health.....	..	1	..	1
No data or stay not long	254	277	371	902
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>54. Special Releases</u>				
Bad conduct - to detention home.....	4	15	9	28
Medical treatment.....	8	4	9	21
Feeble-minded.....	1	19	1	21
Family left jurisdiction of court.....	2	6	17	25
Special court order.....	4	4	4	12
Private case - not delinquent.....	3	1	2	6
No prospect of improvement.....	3	6	10	19
U. S. Navy enlistment...	1	1	4	6
Age 17 - jurisdiction expired.....	5	3	..	8
Truancy - not returned..	23	78	95	196
Delinquent after truancy	..	68	..	68
Good conduct after truancy.....	21	..	..	21
None recorded.....	213	101	255	569
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
<u>55. Agency to which Released</u>				
Home.....	218	163	205	586
Detention home.....	5	29	20	54
Institution for defectives.....	..	17	..	17
Hospital.....	4	..	7	11
Starr Commonwealth.....	..	1	..	1
Relatives.....	6	12	12	30
Charities.....	2	1	7	10
Foster-parents.....	2	2	5	9
Farm to work.....	22	13	8	43
No data.....	29	68	142	239
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>56. Delinquency Types after Release</u>				
Truancy or petty offense	30	18	4	52
Violation parole or probation.....	2	14	..	16
Larceny, etc.....	18	58	..	76
Serious felonies.....	15	84	1	100
Sex offenses.....	1	12	..	13
No data or none recorded	222	120	401	743
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>57. Reason for Maladjustment after Release</u>				
Home conditions.....	19	19	2	40
Educational difficulties	1	3	..	4
Maladjustment without criminal activities..	6	18	..	24
Associates in neighborhood.....	12	29	..	41
Gang leader.....	..	3	..	3
Personality and emo- tional inadequacy....	2	19	..	21
No data or none recorded	248	215	404	867
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000
<u>58. Further Institutionalization</u>				
Boys' Vocational School.	..	132	..	132
Ionia (State Reformatory)	..	9	..	9

TABLE LXVI--CONTINUED

Category	Successes	Failures	Unknown	Total
The Entire Group Studied	288	306	406	1000
58. <u>Further Institutionalization</u> (continued)				
Jackson (State Penitentiary).....	..	9	..	9
Wayne County House of Correction.....	..	6	..	6
State or Federal Reformatories.....	..	5	..	5
Others - for delinquency ..	..	6	..	6
Returned to Ford Republic.....	..	20	1	21
Institutions for delinquents.....	..	35	..	35
Institutions for dependents or neglected... ..	..	1	..	1
None recorded.....	288	83	405	776
Totals.....	288	306	406	1000

[illegible]

Siblings' Work Inc.			

Neighborhood			
Type of residence	Business?		
Type of home	Railroad?		
Neighborhood boys at F. R. same time		Gang life	
Amount of Juvenile Delinquency in vicinage		Total Family Inc.	
Home tenancy by	Rooms	Cost	Furnishings

No. associates	Continuous or int. del.	Age first offence
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		
65		
66		
67		
68		
69		
70		
71		
72		
73		
74		
75		
76		
77		
78		
79		
80		
81		
82		
83		
84		
85		
86		
87		
88		
89		
90		
91		
92		
93		
94		
95		
96		
97		
98		
99		
100		

Special Schools..... Probation.....

At F. R. Total time to release _____ days. School Record _____

Truant	times	days.	Work Rating

Actual stay.....days. Bank Account.....

Special reasons for long stay Social Court

Other

Library

Released to _____ Sex Del _____

Adjustment satisfactory when last known? Religion Attendance

Lenth of adj.....time on F. R. Supervision.....

Types and Reasons for Maladjustments -----

Institutions after F. R.	Why Committed	Comment
--------------------------	---------------	---------

Intelligence Test 750 — 1 8 85 — 11 11 1

Physical Peculiarities		
G. A.	M. A.	I. G.

[illegible]

Personality Traits

Special comment or significant factors not covered elsewhere

001 002 003 004 005 006 007 008 009 010 011 012 013 014 015 016 017 018 019 020 021 022 023 024 025 026 027 028 029 030 031 032 033 034 035 036 037 038 039 040 041 042 043 044 045 046 047 048 049 050 051 052 053 054 055 056 057 058 059 060 061 062 063 064 065 066 067 068 069 070 071 072 073 074 075 076 077 078 079 080 081 082 083 084 085 086 087 088 089 090 091 092 093 094 095 096 097 098 099 100

168

